

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAE NSIS



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

[illegible][illegible]

I am writing to you in the hope that you will find this letter of interest. I am writing to you in the hope that you will find this letter of interest. I am writing to you in the hope that you will find this letter of interest.

Yours faithfully,
[Signature]

[Faint, illegible text in the lower section of the page, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.]



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/0162006452658>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR BONNIE ELAINE YOUNG
TITLE OF THESIS Q METHODOLOGY IN COUNSELING JOB DISSATISFIED ADULTS
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF EDUCATION
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED SPRING, 1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

T6G 4X2

DATED

Dec 11, 1984
.....

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FROM

NAME OF AUTHOR: JENNIFER L. JAMES

TITLE OF THESIS: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THIS THESIS WAS PREPARED: MASTER OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1982

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only. The author reserves other publication rights, and without the prior written consent of the author no part of this thesis may be printed or otherwise reproduced.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the author has signed this statement at Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, on the 15th day of May, 1982.

JENNIFER L. JAMES

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

1982

DATE: May 15, 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Q METHODOLOGY IN COUNSELING JOB DISSATISFIED ADULTS

by

BONNIE ELAINE YOUNG

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATON

IN

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Q METHODOLOGY IN COUNSELING JOB DISSATISFIED ADULTS submitted by BONNIE ELAINE YOUNG in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION in COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY.

DateDec 11/84.....

Dedication

This work is dedicated to the management and staff of the Alberta Career Centre who consistently encourage the development of new ideas in the field of career counseling.

Abstract

The study was designed to assess the usefulness of a locally produced Q-sort, the Q Sort of Job Satisfaction, in counseling job dissatisfied adults. Fifty-eight adults, describing themselves as either Very, Moderately or Slightly Dissatisfied, attended a three-evening workshop, the first evening of which they used the Q-sort. Client perceptions of its usefulness were gathered by a pre-test, post-test and follow-up questionnaire. The adults did not feel the Q-sort helped them move from a feeling of general dissatisfaction to an understanding of the specifics of the problem. Instead they reported the Q-sort forced them to consider their priorities and had confirmed some problems already suspected. Reaction to the Q-sort was different for each sub-group both immediately after use and after six weeks. The conclusion drawn was that the Q Sort of Job Satisfaction is a useful tool for beginning the counseling process because it provides a structure for identifying both satisfiers and dissatisfiers, and motivates the client to further problem solving.

Acknowledgements

Since the idea for the Q Sort of Job Satisfaction which led to this study originated in 1981, there are many people whose support and encouragement I wish to acknowledge.

Most recently, Dr. Henry Janzen, thesis advisor, and Dr. George Fitzsimmons have been of most help in turning the original idea into a project that could be developed into this thesis. I also wish to thank Dr Ken Ward, external examiner for his comments about the thesis and other related research.

Ms. Joie Miller of the Alberta Career Centre in Red Deer played a special role in this project and deserves a very special word of thanks. It was at the invitation to join her in developing a Q-sort relevant to career counseling that I became involved in developing and using the Q Sort of Job Satisfaction.

I also wish to thank the staff of the Edmonton Career Centre who so often encouraged and supported me in my attempts to design a new counselling service for job dissatisfied adults. Their suggestions were consistently constructive and helpful.

Finally, I wish to thank my husband, Arnie, for his encouragement and patience. Without his support, the seemingly endless nights and weekends involved in completing such a project would have been quite daunting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Significance of the Study	1
Definition of Terms	3
Purpose of the Study	8
Significance for the Field of Career Counseling	10
Limitations	11
Overview of the Study	12
II RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	13
Theories Related to Job Satisfaction	13
Job Facets Theories	13
Process Theories	15
Content Theories	18
Methodology	24
Theory and Practice	24
Strengths and Limitations	30
III DESIGN, METHODOLOGY AND INSTRUMENTATION	34
Data Gathering Procedure	34
Instrumentation	35
Pre-test	35
Post-test	36
Follow-up Questionnaire	36
Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction	37
The Sample	39
Research Questions	40

Chapter	Page
Evaluation of Data	40
IV FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	42
Introduction	42
Sample Characteristics	42
Research Question One	53
Conclusions	55
Research Question Two	55
Post-test Data	56
Conclusion	59
Follow-up Data	60
Conclusion	62
Research Question Three	62
Conclusion	66
Research Question Four	67
Conclusion	70
V DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72
Introduction	72
Discussion	72
Implications for Career Counseling	78
Congruence of Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction with Current Theories	80
Recommendations	83
Suggestions for Further Research	85
Selected References	87

Chapter	Page
Appendix A: Examining Job Dissatisfaction #1	92
B: Examining Job Dissatisfaction #2	96
C: Q-Sort Questionnaire	100
D: Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction	103
E: Examining Job Satisfaction	107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Significance of the Study

In the last decade researchers in both the United States and Canada have reported an appreciable decline in job satisfaction. Staines (1979) reports that the Quality of Employment survey program he directed at the University of Michigan found that between 1973 and 1977 "workers in virtually all occupational and demographic categories evidenced appreciable declines in job satisfaction along with other, quite unmistakable, manifestations of rising discontent" (Staines, 1979:39). In Canada, Atkinson (1983) and his colleagues conducted national surveys of attitudes toward work in 1977, 1979 and 1981. The results indicated that while not a large proportion--less than 20 percent--of workers are dissatisfied with their jobs, the percentage of people who have changed the rating of their attitudes from "very satisfied" to "fairly satisfied" (Atkinson, 1983:40) has definitely increased. Atkinson feels it is fair to surmise that if a similar study had been conducted in 1983, it would show a continued deterioration in positive attitudes since the economic situation thought responsible for the 1979-81 change has only worsened. While this seems to contradict the hypothesis that rising unemployment would produce gratitude in workers who still have jobs, Atkinson's data indicate that it is the satisfaction from non-monetary dimensions of work that is declining. In other words, workers may be grateful for regular paychecks but they do not find their work as satisfying as it has been in the past.

These findings have definite implications for counseling agencies like the Alberta Career Centres which offer "a variety of services to Albertans needing assistance in all aspects of career development" (Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower, 1981:20). It is very likely that if the decline in satisfaction with work continues, "job dissatisfaction" will be identified as a "career problem" and career counselors will be sought for their assistance, suggestions, and ideas for dealing with the problem. Since the current economic situation is characterized by few vacancies in the work force, workers will not so readily be able to "solve" the problem by merely quitting their present jobs and searching for new ones.

It is for these dissatisfied workers who feel "locked in" to their jobs, for the short term if not necessarily for the long term, that the career counselor may be hard pressed to produce counseling tools or processes. While there is a great variety of tools (interest tests, occupational choice kits, computerized occupational data) for use with a person contemplating an occupational change, there are no instruments for helping the dissatisfied person in clarifying or analyzing the difficulties, in assessing priorities or setting goals so that s/he can devise strategies to deal with the dissatisfaction. Unfortunately most of the existing instruments dealing with worker attitudes have been devised to do the research that will be quoted in the following pages. While they are undoubtedly necessary for our understanding of the overall problem of declining satisfaction in our work force, they are usually of little use to a counselor confronted with a job dissatisfied client.

In adapting counseling instruments or methodology to a new topic, it seems wise to undertake evaluations at various steps in the process. Recommendations and even insights, from each evaluation can be incorporated in the next phase of development. This study was undertaken because of the need to gather information about the effectiveness of a Q-sort (the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction) when used as a counseling tool with job dissatisfied workers. Since it is itself a very new instrument, data about its potential effectiveness could be used to support recommendations that more extensive research to establish its assumed validity and reliability be undertaken. To this point, any data gathered about the tool had supported its efficacy with clients who were making new occupational choices. Evidence that it could also be of assistance to job dissatisfied clients--therefore, that it is an instrument of considerable versatility--would surely be welcomed.

Of almost equal significance is the notion of conceptualizing job dissatisfied adults as a separate and distinct group of career planners for whom a specific service may be needed. Among the career centres in Alberta, this is the first time a service for this particular group has been designed. While it is not the intention of this study to argue the legitimacy of this concept, it is certainly an issue that career centre personnel will have to consider as they assess client needs and plan new services.

Definition of Terms

There are two areas of this study which contain potential for confusion due to terminology alone. The first is the study of job

attitudes in which one finds terms like "job satisfaction" or "job dissatisfaction." The second is the terminology of career counseling in which one hears references to "careers," "jobs" and "occupations." An additional problem is that even if one finds and adopts definitions upon which theoreticians or researchers or even practitioners agree, one is likely to encounter confusion about the meaning of these terms among the public who will, in fact, be the subjects for this study. However, in order to provide the reader with a frame of reference with which s/he may follow both the writer's conceptualizations and subject's struggles to understand and use these terms, definitions and descriptions of the major terms will be provided.

Job Satisfaction may be defined as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976:1300). In order to promote understanding of the source of this emotional reaction, Locke (1976) states that workers appraise their jobs as either attaining or allowing the attainment of their important job values. These job values should be congruent with or help fulfill their basic needs of which there are two types: Physical needs and psychological needs, especially the need for growth. While Locke (1976) sees most industrial psychologists as accepting this definition, he feels that the "operational definitions" derived as they try to measure job satisfaction are not always congruent with the conceptual definition and therefore, there become as many definitions for the concept as there are instruments or researchers. Going back to the

original definition Locke (1976) lists the values or conditions most conducive to job satisfaction as:

1. mentally challenging work with which the individual can cope successfully.
2. personal interest in the work itself
3. work which is not too physically tiring
4. rewards for performance which are just, informative, and in line with the individual's personal aspirations
5. working conditions which are compatible with the individual's physical needs and which facilitate the accomplishment of his work goals
6. high self-esteem on the part of the employee
7. agents in the work place who help the employee to attain job values such as interesting work, pay, and promotions, whose basic values are similar to his own and who minimize role conflict and ambiguity (Locke, 1976:1328).

The concept of job satisfaction is related but not identical to the concepts of morale and job involvement. Both morale and job satisfaction refer to positive emotional states. However, morale is more future-oriented and has a group referent (Locke, 1976) while satisfaction is present or past oriented and refers to the appraisal a single person makes of only his/her own job. Locke (1976) uses Viteles' definition of morale as "an attitude of satisfaction with, desire to continue in, and willingness to strive for the goals of a particular group or organization" (Viteles, 1953:284) to suggest that morale is perhaps a result of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction does not mean the same as job involvement either. Locke sees a person who is involved with his job as "one who takes it seriously, for whom important values are at stake in the job, whose moods and feelings are significantly affected by his job experiences and who is mentally pre-occupied with his job" (Locke, 1976:1301). Since this definition can describe either a negative (dissatisfied) response or a positive (satisfied) response, the definition of involvement seems more relevant to the degree one experiences satisfaction or dissatisfaction but not to whether or how one experiences it. It seems logical to predict that a person who is highly involved with his/her job would feel extremely satisfied or dissatisfied while an uninvolved person would experience less intense emotional reactions in either direction.

Job Dissatisfaction has not been defined in the literature. For the purposes of this study it will be defined in terms of the definition for job satisfaction. Thus, job dissatisfaction will refer to an unpleasant or negative emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. It will be used on occasion to describe the overall reaction to the job but subjects will also be asked to give their reaction or to describe their dissatisfaction with various aspects of their jobs. No attempt will be made to obtain reactions to all of the conditions listed by Locke.

Career refers to "the course a person takes as s/he progresses through life" (Davidson & Tippett, 1976:3). It includes a variety of jobs in a number of occupations, a number of educational and training experiences, a sequence of hobbies and leisure activities as well as

marriage and the raising of a family. Therefore, every person has a career. That portion of counseling referred to as "career counseling" is, theoretically at least, concerned with helping a person make decisions about any aspect of his/her career. In practice the adults who seek career counseling have usually requested help in making decisions about jobs, occupations or education and training.

Occupation is used to refer to any particular type of work. The term biologist, for example, is really an occupational title and allows us to think of the similarities in duties or skills of any number of people in that field. The term "occupation" does not imply that the person is working nor does it relate the specifics of his/her employment. An "occupation changer" therefore, is someone who wishes to leave a certain type of work and move on to or train for another type of work. A truck driver who wishes to become an electrician is making an occupational change.

Job is the term used to refer to the position a person holds in a company, factory, institution or organization (Davidson & Tippett, 1976:2). It includes the details of the duties, supervision, pay and benefits which may or may not be the same from company to company. A "job changer" then, is someone who wishes to find a different position or place of employment within the same occupation. A teacher moving from one school to another is making a job change. Should that person decide to leave teaching and search for a job in an insurance company, s/he would then be classified as an occupation changer.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to ascertain whether the Q-sort of Job Satisfaction is a useful tool for the counseling of job dissatisfied adults. Usefulness, at this point, is being determined only by client perceptions. Therefore clients were asked for their reactions to the tool itself. Then they were asked for their perceptions of the effect of using the Q-sort on their attitudes toward their jobs. Lastly, they were asked to provide their perceptions of how use of the Q-sort influenced their career decisions or plans for action.

The first intent was to discover whether the Q-sort could assist clients in specifying or articulating more clearly specific dissatisfactions with their work. It was felt that many clients have a general overriding feeling of dissatisfaction with their jobs but are not able to articulate the specific factors bothering them.

The second intent was to ascertain what other benefits clients using the Q-sort might be deriving from it. Since use of the Q-sort with this clientele has no precedents, it was felt that a position of open-mindedness to the benefits of its use was appropriate. This seemed especially important since one of the major advantages of using the Q-sort has been its characteristic of uncovering relations not expected by the researcher (Kerlinger, 1972:34).

The third intent was to attempt to discover whether any one type of client found the Q-sort more useful than other types. While the possibilities for "typing" or grouping the sample seemed almost limitless (eg. by age, sex, education, years at work, occupation or combinations of

these), it was decided that the groupings might also be based on client perceptions of their situations. Therefore, each client was asked to describe him/herself as either "slightly dissatisfied," "moderately dissatisfied," or "very dissatisfied." Each of these labels was followed by a statement intended to supply some general terms of reference. Therefore, "very dissatisfied" was defined as "almost ready to quit," "moderately dissatisfied" meant "almost as many negative as positive aspects about the job" and "slightly dissatisfied" was synonymous with "there are a few factors you'd like changed." While the intent was to use these three sub-groups for the comparison, the position of open-mindedness to the emergence of other subgroups who were benefiting significantly was maintained.

The fourth intent was to discover whether and how clients' perceptions of the Q-sort had changed in a period of 4-6 weeks after its initial use. Clients were sent follow-up questionnaires which asked them not only their reactions to the tool itself, but how much using it had influenced both their attitudes toward their jobs and any career decisions or plans they had made since using it. This information was significant for several reasons. First of all, the effects of a particular tool are usually deemed to be of more value if they last over time. Therefore, not only is it of interest to see whether what was originally perceived as a product or result held up over six weeks, but whether in fact what had originally been seen as a product was still perceived as a product. Secondly, since there would be no further follow up to check whether the clients' feelings or behaviors in their jobs had actually changed, the best means of gathering information regarding

actual behavior seemed to be asking the client to state his/her career decisions or plans and comment on whether these had been influenced by the Q-sort. Again, by phrasing the question in general terms, clients were able to respond in terms of their present jobs, new jobs, new occupations or combinations of these.

Significance for the Field of Career Counseling

The item of main significance to the field of career counseling is the concept of the job dissatisfied client as a unique type of career planner. Whereas in the past a person who complained of disliking his/her work might have been assessed as someone needing a job change or perhaps even an occupational change, now, with new terms of reference the assessment, and consequently the service offered might be quite different. The new concept will almost certainly provide finer levels of discrimination among the "typical" types of career problems.

The challenge to the field of career counseling is to determine whether this concept is in fact a legitimate base for special service. Just as one had to decide whether the "disabled" were "special" career planners and needed "special" services, counselors will have to gather information as to whether the "job dissatisfied" are "special," whether they have special needs and if in fact they change at some point from one category to another.

Limitations

Since data were collected within the context of a regular service at the Alberta Career Centre, the need for consistent service delivery placed some limitations upon the study. For instance, it was deemed unacceptable to keep clients waiting for a number of weeks if the desired service was available, so a control group to check the effect of time and information alone on perceptions of dissatisfaction was not used. Furthermore, since the use of the Q-sort was not considered a full service, it became the first session of a two-session workshop. The probability of some contamination of perceptions was present then for although every effort was made to help participants distinguish between the two sessions, it was especially difficult after six weeks for subjects to remember exactly which reactions or insights had occurred in which session.

The factor of researcher bias must also be considered in view of the researcher's professional involvement with the Career Centre. Due to lack of familiarity with the Q-sort of Job Satisfaction on the part of other staff members, the researcher led all the groups and collected all the data herself. On the other hand, since the researcher had also been involved in the design of the instrument, she was able to gather incidental information about the wording of items, clarity of instructions, etc. that she could compare across groups and build into recommendations about the instrument itself.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study has been briefly introduced in this chapter, and is followed by more detailed information concerning the theoretical and research aspects of the study.

Chapter II is a review of the theories most relevant and related to job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. It also includes a review of the theory and practice of using a Q-Sort with comments about the strengths and limitations of this instrument.

Chapter III outlines the design of the research portion of the study and provides information about all instruments used.

Chapter IV contains the findings and immediate conclusions drawn for each of the four research questions.

Chapter V consists of further discussion of the findings, and their implications for career counseling. It also includes some evaluative comments of the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction in terms of the aforementioned theories and some recommendations for the use of Q-Sorts and further research.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Theories Related to Job Satisfaction

Since the 1920's and Mayo's first inquiries into "the industrial dissatisfaction involved in a textile mill" (Locke, 1976:1298), studies of workers' attitudes toward their jobs have generally been lumped together and referred to as studies of job satisfaction. While literature about job satisfaction has been accumulating in vast amounts (Locke, 1976:1297), all that is necessary here is an understanding of the major approaches used to study job attitudes. They are most concisely reviewed by Edwin A. Locke in "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction" (Dunnette, 1976) and may be grouped together as either job facets theories, process theories or content theories.

Job Facets Theories

"Proponents of job facets theory generally reject the notion that there exists some omnibus feeling of job satisfaction" (Bess, 1981:7). Since each job is a "complex interrelationship of tasks, roles, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards" (Locke, 1976:1301), facet theorists believe that workers tend to be satisfied or dissatisfied with particular elements of their jobs. The approach most often used to identify these elements has been factor analysis. The researcher produces a number of job attitude items, obtains responses to them from a number of employees and then the responses are intercorrelated to produce factors or clusters of items that correlate

more highly with each other than with other items. The basic job element associated with that factor is inferred from the content of the items making up the factor. Using this approach,

Lodahl (1964) concluded that there were at least five related independent dimensions of work which were necessary to account for variations in affect on the job: supervision, organization, salary, working conditions, and opportunity for advancement (Bess, 1981:8).

After his review of the literature, Locke lists "the typical job dimensions" (Locke, 1976:1302) studied as "work, pay, promotions, recognition, benefits, working conditions, supervision, co-workers, and company and management."

The methodology used in facet theory research is usually the presentation of a questionnaire with long lists of job characteristics. The procedure, however, leads to as many different factor structures as there are studies since

the results depend upon the particular items that the researcher happened to include, the nature of the employee sample tested, the particular jobs involved, the environment in which the employees work, and the method of analyses used on the data (Locke, 1976:1301).

Furthermore, Locke feels that this approach cannot substitute for or verify a conceptual analysis of job dimensions. He believes that the job dimensions to be studied can just as easily be isolated conceptually and in the end, depend on the particular goals of the researcher.

Process Theories

The term "process theories" refers to those models of job satisfaction which attempt to specify the types of variables considered causally relevant as well as how those variables combine to determine job satisfaction. Expectancy theory, for example, originally used to explain causes of behavior, has been extended to include the concept of satisfaction—"both as a resultant of behavior and a cause of it" (Bess, 1981:9). According to many expectancy theorists, workers evaluate outcomes as to whether they are perceived as leading to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Then whether a person participates in a certain activity depends both on whether the activity is perceived as leading to satisfaction (ie. having a positive or negative valence) and on the degree to which attainment of an outcome seems probable. Some theorists see the force of the person's inclination to act as the product of the perceived valence of the outcome and the probability of achievement. That is, force (F) may be derived by the formula $F = f[\sum(EV)]$ where E is the expectation or probability and V is valence for each factor (f) involved.

Lawler & Nadler (1977) have extended the original conceptualization of expectancy theories by pointing out the existence of different kinds of expectancies. The first is the person's expectancy that his/her efforts will lead to successful performance ($E \rightarrow P$). Nadler and Lawler then suggest that the second expectancy refers to the probability of receiving an outcome with a successful performance ($P \rightarrow O$). A third level of expectancy is concerned with instrumentality of the outcomes

since they suggest that the first outcome may lead to other outcomes ($O_1 \rightarrow O_2$) each with its own potential for satisfaction or dissatisfaction. "One of the most important contributions of the expectancy models is the recognition of the contingencies between effort, performance, first and second level outcomes" (Lawler & Suttle, 1973) that is, at each point of expectancy ($E \rightarrow P$, $P \rightarrow O$, $O_1 \rightarrow O_2$) there may be intrinsic and extrinsic factors which determine the individual's assignment of probabilities to the relationship between the variables. Prior learning, personality, self-esteem, role expectations, and the demands of the current situation, for example, all enter into a person's determination of the degree to which effort will result in successful performance (Bess, 1981:10).

In his extensive review of expectancy theories, Locke's (1976) major criticism is that while the terms "need" and "value" occur frequently, there are no definitions with which to distinguish one from the other. Therefore, the suggestion that "it is the degree to which the job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of the individual's needs that determines his degree of job satisfaction" (Locke, 1976:1303) still requires explanation. Are the users of this concept defining "need" as the "objective requirements of an organism's survival and well-being" (Locke, 1976:1303) which "exist whether the organism has knowledge of them or not" (Locke, 1976:1303)? Do they see it as conceptually different from the term "value" which Locke defines as that which one consciously or subconsciously desires and for which one will actively strive to gain or keep? While Locke believes that many theorists simply

use the terms "need" and "value" synonymously, he argues that only more detailed definition of the concepts will allow the understanding of how they may be interacting to determine satisfaction.

Locke himself believes that any definition of value should point out the two attributes of a value: context (what is valued) and intensity (how much it is valued). This allows a person's values to be ranked according to importance, or, in other terms, for his/her value hierarchy to be represented. It also allows for the notion that the degree of job satisfaction reflects both the discrepancy between what is wanted and what is being obtained at work, and the importance of that value. Using graphs, Locke (1976:1305) demonstrates how

importance affects the range of affect which a given value can produce. Given a random distribution of percept-value discrepancies, more important values will lead to greater overall variability in affect than less important values (Locke, 1976:1305).

Using this conceptualization of value Locke feels may help explain what Vroom (1964) felt was a conflict between a "subtractive" model and a "multiplicative" model of job satisfaction. The subtractive model sees satisfaction as a "function of percept (cognition)--value discrepancy ... but ignores the effect of value importance" (Locke, 1976:1306). The multiplicative model "views satisfaction as a function of the product of the perceived amount of the value (offered by the job) and value importance but ignores value-percept discrepancy" (Locke, 1976:1306). Both these models of determining job satisfaction "fail to distinguish

between the 'amount of the value wanted' by the person and 'how much the person wants that amount'" (Locke, 1976:1307).

Content Theories

"Content Theories attempt to specify the particular needs that must be satisfied or the values that must be attained for an individual to be satisfied with his job" (Locke, 1976:1307). The two most well-known and most influential theories are Maslow's Need Hierarchy theory and Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene theory. Although Maslow did not develop his theory with work motivation or job satisfaction in mind, the implications of it for work design or re-design are clear.

Stated simply, Maslow's theory suggests that a human has five basic categories of needs: physiological needs; safety needs, including both freedom from bodily harm and economic insecurity; belongingness and love needs; esteem needs of two types: the need for personal mastery and achievement as well as the need for recognition and approval of others; and the need for self-actualization. Maslow asserts that these needs are arranged in an hierarchy of importance with "importance" being directly associated with actual physical survival. The order mentioned above is the order in which needs must be satisfied for according to Maslow's theory, satisfaction for needs at the upper levels of the hierarchy is neither desired nor sought until the preceding level of needs has been fulfilled.

Thus, for example, the need for safety will not motivate behavior or produce satisfaction when attained until the physiological needs are fulfilled; similarly, the need for

self-actualization will not become operative until all four of the more prepotent needs (physiological, safety, belongingness, self-esteem) are fulfilled (Locke, 1976:1307).

Maslow does not claim that there has to be total fulfillment of any given need before the needs of the next level begin to exert their influence but rather that the first levels of the hierarchy must be relatively more fulfilled than the next higher that is becoming operative.

In his review of this theory as it pertains to job satisfaction, Locke points out several problems. As was the case with expectancy theorists, Locke criticizes Maslow for not providing clear distinctive definitions for the terms "need" and "value."

Maslow appears to recognize the distinction, but implies that it is irrelevant since he believes that 'most often, under good conditions, what [man] wants is what he needs (what is good for him) in order to avoid sickness' (1954:125) (Locke, 1976:1308).

In fact this is not true since although humans have the same innate needs, they choose or value different ways of satisfying their needs, not all of which are good for them (eg. alcoholics). The problem of definition arises again with the term self-actualization. While the phrases "to become more and more of what one is" and "to become everything one is capable of becoming" are associated with the term, Locke says that "as Maslow defines it, the term self-actualization has no coherent meaning and cannot be used to explain anything" (Locke, 1976:1308).

A rather larger question raised by Locke is directed at the notion of needs being organized as operating in an hierarchy. He notes that while Maslow's theory says that a satisfied need is not a motivator, no need is ever permanently satisfied by one event or series of actions. It must continually, repeatedly be satisfied, and therefore, one might assume, this may be happening at all levels all the time. Indeed, Locke quotes Maslow as saying "behavior tends to be determined by several or all of the basic needs simultaneously rather than by only one of them (p.154, p.102)" (Locke, 1976:1309). This seems to contradict the idea of needs satisfaction occurring in a fixed hierarchial order and is supported in the research of Lawler and Suttle (1972). They found no evidence to suggest a five level hierarchy but suggested instead a two-level hierarchy in which the lowest level would consist of the basic "biological needs (hunger, thirst, reproduction, oxygen and physical safety) while all other needs are on the second level" (Lawler & Suttle, 1972:285). Since throughout their study they found no evidence to support Maslow's assertion that as the satisfaction of a need increases, its importance decreases, they speculate that

all the lower level would have to be sufficiently satisfied before the higher level ones would come into play. Further, once the lower level needs were satisfied, no prediction could be made about which higher level need would come into play or about what the sequence would be in which the various needs would come into play (Lawler & Suttle, 1972:285).

Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene theory was developed around the study of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. The theory states that job

satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different causes. Job satisfaction depends on factors associated with the work itself: achievement, promotion, recognition, and responsibility. These factors have been called Motivators and are different, Herzberg says, than those factors which are the source of most dissatisfaction: supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, company policies, and salary. These he calls "Hygienes" and points out that they primarily involve the context in which the work is done.

After Herzberg had produced this theory about job satisfaction, he expanded it by suggesting it paralleled a "specific view of the nature of man" (Locke, 1976:1310). He suggested the existence of two separate classes of human needs: physical needs and psychological needs.

The need to use one's mind which he calls psychological growth, is satisfied by such actions as increasing one's knowledge, making abstract integrations, creative activity, being effective in ambiguity, developing individuality and the like (Locke, 1976:1310).

The major difference between the effects of satisfying these two types of needs is the link with the two factor job satisfaction theory. While satisfying a physical need may reduce discomfort and produce relief, Herzberg believes that that does not produce pleasure. On the other hand satisfaction of a psychological need does produce pleasure but failure to satisfy the need for growth does not produce displeasure. The two theories merge to see Hygiene factors operating to satisfy physical needs

and prevent dissatisfaction, while Motivators operate to fulfill the worker's growth needs and produce satisfaction.

Of particular interest to this study are Locke's (1976) criticism of Herzberg's idea that needs cause affect in only one direction and his findings in the literature that very few researchers obtain results similar to Herzberg's when they try to replicate his studies. With regard to the operation of needs, Locke sees very little justification for the idea that either physical or psychological needs cause affect in only one direction. That would be to say that the intake of food is associated only with the reduction of hunger and that the pleasure taste and texture of food afford is negligible. Locke goes on to argue that contrary to what Herzberg believes, there is a negative side to not obtaining a motivator for "'a,' if not 'the' primary cause of the unhappiness of neurotics is their lack of self-esteem (failure to grow, in Herzberg's model). It is not due to lack of food, water, air, or toilets" (Locke, 1976:1311). There seems to be a minimization of individual differences and the degree to which there may be different sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for different people. Locke mentions, for instance, that "Hulin (1971) and Hulin and Blood (1968) have presented convincing evidence that all employees do not value jobs which allow them the opportunity for psychological growth" (Locke, 1976:1314).

In order for most theories to be taken seriously, the results originally obtained should be obtained when the research is replicated. Locke's (1976) review of research, however, does not show this to be the case. When Herzberg's exact method was used, his original pattern of

results has been found in some instances. However when the method was varied slightly to use the notions of "events" and "agents" instead of Motivators and Hygienes, Schneider and Locke (1971) "found that the same classes of events were seen as responsible for both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These were mainly task-related, Motivator-type events" (Locke, 1976:1314). Using the event/agent classification system on both blue and white collar workers, Locke did find that Hygiene factors were mentioned more often as dissatisfiers than satisfiers, but that motivators were mentioned almost equally often as satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

Along the same lines are the conclusions of Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakel (1966) who developed a Q-sort as a technique for assessing Herzberg's classification of Motivators and Hygienes. After careful testing and rating of 144 items for social desirability, the final Q-sort was composed of 36 negatively worded and 36 positively worded statements about work. One hundred twelve night school students, employed and participating in supervisory training courses, rated the statements on how they contributed to satisfying or dissatisfying situations already described by the subjects.

The Q analyses show a great diversity of the groups of factors perceived as producing satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The factors of achievement, responsibility, and recognition were perceived by many subgroups as contributing to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. However, the factor of work itself was mentioned only in describing satisfaction. The

authors conclude from the study that the Herzberg two factor theory is much too simplistic to account for the complex patterns of results obtained (Robinson, Athanasiou, Head, 1969:113).

Regardless of this finding, Herzberg's theory remains quite popular and is still used as a basis for studying job dissatisfaction. As recently as 1982, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Education Research Association described how Herzberg's theory was being used to study "teacher burnout." Teachers who had resigned responded to questionnaires to test the hypotheses that a) teachers who resigned from teaching would report no job satisfaction relative to the motivation component of the Hygiene-Motivation theory; and 2) teachers who resigned from teaching will report job dissatisfaction relative to the hygiene component. Frataccia and Hennington (1982) report their findings as supporting the first hypothesis for within the hygiene component the teachers were dissatisfied with all factors. However they also say that within the motivation component the teachers reported dissatisfaction with recognition, advancement and achievement. With this observation, the authors seem to be presenting more evidence that in fact Herzberg's Motivators and Hygienes do not differ from each other in ability to produce satisfaction and dissatisfaction respectively.

Q Methodology

Theory and Practice

The term Q-sort is most often associated with William Stephenson because of his extensive interest and thinking about Q methodology. Kerlinger (1972) credits Stephenson with bringing "fresh and imaginative psychological insight" (Kerlinger, 1972:4) to the methodology and believes that "Stephenson's most important contribution may well be the correlative notions of building theory into Q-sorts and structuring Q-sorts along Fisherran analysis of variance lines" (Kerlinger, 1972:4). While the notion of building theory into an instrument of psychological measurement is not new, it was a developmental step when applied to the Q-sort because in most situations the sorting of items and factor analyses which could follow were perceived as the major benefits of the technique. Stephenson demonstrated what he meant by his "structuring of Jungian theory into a three-factor Q-sort" (Kerlinger, 1972:4). However, even with his urging for this use of the Q-sort, there has been little response. Kerlinger mentions "it is difficult to find Q studies in which Q-sorts have been systematically constructed to represent a theory or part of a theory" (Kerlinger, 1972:4). Examples of theories that have been used as a basis for Q-sorts are Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene theory (Dunnette, Campbell & Hakel, 1966), Kubler-Ross' stage theory of death and dying (Metzger, 1979), R. J. Havighurst's theory of developmental tasks (Netzberg, 1980) and Loevinger's theory of ego development (Rozsnafszky, 1981).

There was, however, a major response to the use of Q-methodology by psychologists wishing to study the "discrepancies between one's self-perception and the perception of an ideal self as an indication of maladjustment" (Wittenborn, 1961:132). The increasing correlation of the individual's Q-sort description of his true self with the Q-sort of his ideal self during psychotherapy was taken as evidence of improvement and "in the opinion of many persons these studies comprised the first acceptable indication that psychotherapy was efficacious in producing personality change" (Wittenborn, 1961:133). A further benefit was the use of factor analysis "to illuminate some of the features of the psychotherapeutic process" (Wittenborn, 1961:133).

Over the years Q-sort methodology has been used to study a myriad of topics. Wittenborn (1961) reports on Q-sorts used in the study of such divergent aspects of personality as the concept of a healthy personality, the degree of a patient's emotional disturbance, and the degree of hostility displayed by students to their peers. The methodology has been adopted for the study of psychopathology, especially with schizophrenics, but also with the mothers of schizophrenics. A search of the literature of the past nine years reveals that the variety of topics has not decreased. Within the field of teacher education Q-sorts are being used to study the self concept and behavior perception changes of student teachers (Peterson, 1980) and the priorities of teacher behaviors perceived by student teachers (Housego & Boldt, 1978). Within public schools themselves, Q-sorts are suggested for identifying and checking students' evaluations of each other based on non-verbal cues (Jensen, 1979), assessing attitudes toward and knowledge about nutrition (Sutnick,

1981) and assessing the priorities adolescents place on developmental tasks (Nitzberg, 1980). However, this methodology is also being used to study topics relevant to the larger society. These include a Q-sort of political cartoons to study patterns of voter fantasies (Bormann, 1978), the identification of six television viewer types (Gutman, 1978), the use of Q-sorts in old age research in England (Stephenson, 1978), the study of the immediate experiences of movie-goers from the perspective of communications theory (Stephenson, W., 1978), and the attempts to define hyperactive children (Burns & Jenkins, 1975) and scientific literacy (Gabel, 1976) by relevant professionals. The Q-sorts of self concept are still mentioned and reviewed eg. Peterson-Yaakobi Q-sort (Peterson, 1978) but a good deal of space is now devoted to schemes (both manual and computerized) for scoring Q-sorts (Green, 1980; Dunlap, 1978; Dibb & Alexander, 1977). Perhaps one more piece of evidence of the current interest in Q methodology is the existence of "Operant Subjectivity," a Q methodology newsletter.

A review of the literature in terms of the present study with dissatisfied adults revealed no indication that the Q-sort has been used either for research or counseling with this population. As Dunnette, Campbell and Hakel (1967) were developing their Q-sort to test Herzberg's two-factor theory, they did ask subjects to describe both satisfying and dissatisfying job situations but the purpose of the activity was to research the claims of the theory about satisfiers and dissatisfiers, not to assist dissatisfied workers in any way. In 1963 Neff and Helfand designed a Q-sort "to study intraindividual changes in the meaning of

work" (Neff & Helfand, 1963:139) but report only their work with vocational counselors and handicapped clients in testing their instrument for construct validity and internal consistency. Finally, in 1975 Barkley outlined the steps a teacher could use in constructing and using a Q-sort to help students "decide what is important to them or to attempt to identify significant values for themselves" (Barkley, 1975:206). She suggests this is an adaptation of the Q-sort as an evaluative device, and recommends that attention be focused on item content and the sorting process and that "the statistical processes be omitted for teaching purposes" (Barkley, 1975:206). While she says a teacher and class could construct their own Q-sorts around a variety of topics (eg. choosing a marriage partner, choosing type of accommodation) the example she provides consists of factors that might be considered when choosing or evaluating an occupation.

While Barkley (1975) puts forward the notion that any teacher and class of students can produce a simple Q-sort, she does refer to Kerlinger's (1964) guidelines for the actual construction. For instance, Kerlinger (1972) suggests that most subjects can handle Q-sorts of 90 to 100 items but says it is doubtful if more than 100 cards should be used. He suggests that while sorts of less than 60 can be used, reliability and partitioning possibilities are reduced. The optimal size seems to be between 60 and 90 with a general rule being "the more complex the items, the shorter the Q-sort should be--but probably not below 40 items" (Kerlinger, 1972:11).

A second consideration is the shape of the distribution and whether a forced-choice or free sorting procedure will be used. Stephenson's original recommendation was for a "flattened symmetrical distribution of scores for all Q-sorts" (Stephenson, 1953:59). It was not accepted totally and led to a number of studies comparing distribution shapes. Kerlinger (1972) mentions those of Block (1956) and Livson & Nichols (1956). Block compared forced and unforced Q-sorting procedures and concluded that the forced-choice procedure with a quasi-normal distribution provided greater stability and more discrimination. Livson and Nichols found subjects had no particular distribution preferences in a free-choice situation and recommended a forced choice rectangular distribution.

More recent is Brown's (1971) conclusion that the shape of the response distribution has no effect in factor-analytic terms upon the results of Q studies ... Hence, unstructured free-choice distributions are just as valid for factor analysis as are forced-choice quasi-normal distributions (Cottle & McKeown, 1980:58).

However, Brown cautioned that under-free sort conditions some subjects might not use all the categories along the Q-sort continuum or might not use the whole range, and said that further research was needed to study the effects of these irregular sorting patterns. Cottle & McKeown (1980) have begun this research by replicating the distributions in Brown's study and comparing them to seven distributions in which all categories were not used. Specifying that their conclusions are based on a factor analytic framework, they report that "although the varying distributions

of the Q-sorts do not appear to affect factor structure, intercorrelations between Q-sorts are affected by changes in distribution shape" (Cottle & McKeown, 1980:62).

A last technical consideration to keep in mind during the construction of a Q-sort is the possibility of a social desirability factor among items which alone could affect how they are sorted. Edwards & Horst (1953) studied Q-sorts of personality traits and found that social desirability could so influence how items were sorted that the trait being described and the social desirability were completely confounded in the analysis of variance of responses. In 1955 Edwards found the influence so great (again, on personality traits), that he felt he could probably predict the Q-sorts of subjects if he was given the social desirability scale values of the Q-sort items. He concludes that

"social desirability is a significant variable in self-descriptions and it would seem of some importance to consider the possible influence of this variable in constructing samples of items to be used in Q technique studies (Edwards & Horst, 1953:625).

Strengths and Limitations

Preceding the decision to actually construct a Q-sort must come an examination of its strengths and limitations. One notable strength, for instance, is "its close affinity to theory" (Kerlinger, 1964:594). Building a structured Q-sort simply means enunciating a theory clearly enough that the "variables can be related in a logical and empirical

fashion" (Kerlinger, 1964:594). However, perhaps the major strength of Q methodology is "that it makes possible complex comparisons of sets of measures within the data of one individual" (Kerlinger, 1972:27). One individual can be given one or more related Q-sorts, or can sort one Q-sort many times. The data focuses on the characteristics and complexity of that person, and while this may be considered a scientific weakness, it is certainly a clinical strength. Q methodology is especially suited to studying attitude and value changes because while these changes are recognized as being subtle and complex, they likely involve a change in structure which may be noticed when detailed comparisons of Q data are made. In fact, Kerlinger (1972) recommends the Q approach for research problems requiring the study of small, highly specialized groups because actual factors always can be compared.

Another strength is that both analyses of variance and correlational methods can be used. Factor arrays are important for their contribution to analyses and interpretation of data. Kerlinger (1964) mentions that "although seldom used, Q can be a strong aid in scale construction ... the high items of factors arrays should make good scale items" (Kerlinger, 1964:595).

A slightly different type of strength is the usefulness of Q methodology in exploratory research. Kerlinger (1972) suggests that this methodology not only allows a researcher to search for the factors behind a particular belief or attitude, but mentions "its occasional pointing toward alternative theoretical views and possibilities for large-scale cross-sectional experimental and ex-post facto research" (Kerlinger,

1972:29). And finally, a very practical consideration is the fact that people enjoy doing Q sorts. Kerlinger (1972) reports that

"individuals who ordinarily resist responding to scales and questionnaires seem to drop resistance once they start to do a Q-sort--in fact, ... many individuals express keen interest in doing sorts and in discussing the procedure and results (Kerlinger, 1972:34).

On the other hand Q-sorts do have limitations and have been severely criticized for them. For instance, most statistical tests assume that responses to one item do not affect the responses to other items. This assumption of independence is violated with a Q-sort because the placement of any one card does affect the placement of all the rest. Remembering that Q is an ipsative, forced-choice procedure, Kerlinger (1964) says that the important statistical question is whether violation of the assumption of independence is serious enough to invalidate the use of correlational analysis of variance procedures. He feels that "it is doubtful that too much is risked in Q statistical situations if there is a fairly large number of items" (Kerlinger, 1964:595). Perhaps a more serious criticism is that there is a loss of information because "everytime a coefficient of correlation is computed, the elevation (mean) and scatter (standard deviation) of the sets of scores are lost" (Kerlinger, 1964:596).

The second major limitation of Q methodology has to do with sampling. While it is theoretically possible to administer a Q-sort to a large number of people, it is rarely practical or rewarding to do so. Therefore, the researcher can never generalize his/her findings to

populations of people. Furthermore, since Q is an ipsative and not a normative measurement, "one cannot administer two or three Q-sorts, as one can administer two or three tests or scales, to the same persons and then correlate the results, even if a large sample were obtained (Kerlinger, 1972:12).

Another criticism of Q has focused on the forced-choice method of sorting. Kerlinger believes that while critics of Q feel that the forced-choice procedure is unnatural and puts constraints on the sorter, the individuals who actually sort the cards are not troubled by this restriction. As previously mentioned, after investigation into free versus forced-choice methods, Block (1956) and Livson and Nichols (1956) recommend the forced procedure. Kerlinger (1964) adds that very often when using a Q-sort "the important thing is to force individuals to make discriminations that they often will not make unless required to do so" (Kerlinger, 1964:596).

CHAPTER III

DESIGN, METHODOLOGY AND INSTRUMENTATION

The content of Chapter III deals with the procedure involved in conducting the study including the strategy and technique for collecting the data as well as a description of the sample.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data for this study were gathered at the Alberta Career Centre in Edmonton from February, 1983 to February, 1984. As usual, adults who approached this counseling center were invited in for a short ($1\frac{1}{2}$ hour) session during which all the services were described and each person was given the opportunity to register for those that interested him/her. The two session Job Dissatisfaction Workshop was described and offered to employed people. The workshop was scheduled two evenings per month. While most participants registered for the group after the introductory session, several clients were referred to the group by counselors, and several registered for several groups, including the Job Dissatisfaction Workshop, simultaneously. None of the participants was told that data from the Job Dissatisfaction Workshop were being used in a research study. They were told that since the Job Dissatisfaction Workshop was a new service, user comments were being gathered to study its effectiveness and make improvements.

While the data necessary for the study could have been gathered with only a single session devoted to Q sorting, the need to provide a full service to these career center clients necessitated a two session

workshop. In the first session clients used the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction and recorded their results. The second session, one week later, was devoted to analyzing the dissatisfactions and their causes, and discussing strategy for improving the work situations. Therefore, the data were gathered as follows:

1) a pre-test was completed as the first activity of the first session. The clients then used the Q-Sort and recorded their data.

2) a post-test was completed as the first activity of the second session. At the end of that session all participants were asked if they would agree to complete a follow-up questionnaire in 4-6 weeks.

3) four weeks after each workshop a follow-up questionnaire was sent each participant. Attached was a covering letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. It is important to note here that while in some instances the information from the pre-test and post-test was compared, as is usual with this design, some of the most important data were generated by comparing the post-test with the follow-up.

Instrumentation

Pre-test

The pre-test (Appendix A: Examining Job Dissatisfaction #1) was designed to gather data about the sample. Participants were all asked to rate their level of satisfaction with six components (Security, Working Conditions, Compatibility of Skills/Personality With Job, Interpersonal Relationships, Growth and Advancement, Satisfaction With the Work) of their jobs before using the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction. It is from their descriptions of themselves as very dissatisfied, moderately dissatisfied

or slightly dissatisfied that the group data to be used as basis for comparison were generated.

Post-test

The post-test (Appendix B: Examining Job Dissatisfaction #2) was designed to monitor changes in client perceptions of their satisfaction with the above-mentioned six components of their job. It was also designed to gather client perceptions of the usefulness of the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction one week after they had used it.

This was done by presenting a list of ten possible responses and asking clients to "check the ones that are true for you." Space was also provided in which clients could list other benefits of using the Q-Sort or make other comments about it.

Follow-up Questionnaire

The follow-up questionnaire (Appendix C: Q-Sort Questionnaire) was designed to collect the participants' perceptions of the usefulness of the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction four to six weeks after they had used it. The questionnaire was structured so that these responses could be compared with the responses on the post-test questionnaire. As well questions about the influence of the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction on attitude toward job and career decisions or plans were included in an attempt to explore the impact of this instrument on attitudes and career decisions. Since the author anticipated contamination of responses to questions about the Q-Sort session by information generated in the second

session, questions were structured to solicit information about each session individually.

Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction

The Q-Sort (see Appendix D) used in this study is one produced in 1981 at the Alberta Career Centre by Joie Miller and Bonnie Young, two of the career counselors. Since the instrument is very new and currently being piloted by several counselors in both group and individual counseling, there will be no attempt to claim its validity or reliability have been thoroughly empirically established yet. Rather the position will be taken that at least part of the data being gathered in this study will be used to recommend whether or not more exhaustive and technical research be undertaken to refine this instrument and verify its assumed validity and reliability.

The Q-Sort is composed of two sets of 54 cards. The first set, used to describe one's current job, is composed of items worded neither negatively nor positively but as merely impersonal statements. Examples of these items are:

I have sufficient information to do my job. (WO-11-I)

I have chances for advancement. (GR-37-I)

The people I work with are competent. (IN-33-I)

I work well with present deadlines/competition. (SK-23-I)

My job offers me an acceptable benefit package. (SE-4-I)

I am trusted to work independently. (SA-54-I)

The second deck, sorted to describe one's job in its ideal form, uses the content of the first statements but the wording of each statement includes "I want." Examples of these items are:

I want sufficient information to do my job. (WO-11-W)

I want chances for advancement. (GR-37-W)

I want to work with competent people. (IN-33-W)

I want to work with deadlines/competition. (SK-23-W)

I want to have an acceptable benefit package. (SE-4-W)

I want to be trusted to work independently. (SA-54-W)

The content of the 54 items is not unstructured. It was designed to break down into six clusters, each composed of nine items representing the one overall concept of that cluster. As this point in the development of the tool the cluster titles are Security, Working Conditions, Compatibility of Personality/Skills With Job, Interpersonal Relationships, Growth and Advancement, and Satisfaction with the Work Itself. For identification purposes, each card is numbered, and coded according to the cluster and sort to which it belongs.

The first set of cards is sorted along a continuum labelled MOST LIKE MY JOB to LEAST LIKE MY JOB, and the second set along a continuum labelled MOST LIKE MY IDEAL JOB to LEAST LIKE MY IDEAL JOB. In both cases the distribution and values assigned to the cards are as follows:

DISTRIBUTION	1	2	4	7	8	10	8	7	4	2	1
VALUES	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

A response sheet (see Appendix E--"Examining Job Satisfaction") on which each participant records his/her own data is supplied. When both sorts have been completed and all responses have been recorded, the participants compute the differences between the two sorts. Then, with the instructor's help they study their responses noting discrepancies between the "real" and the "ideal." They add the titles of the item groups and inspect the data from the following perspectives:

- a) size and direction of discrepancy by item
- b) location of discrepancies by cluster
- c) number and size of discrepancies per cluster
- d) apparent priority of both items and clusters in the second sort.

It must be noted here that this is a modified version of Q technique and varies from classical technique in that the statistical procedure that would result in a correlation between the two sorts is not completed. In fact, it is the sorter who is encouraged to gather information by examining the rankings s/he has given individual items in the two sorts and the discrepancies between them. Instead of another person looking at the data and drawing conclusions about them, the client is the one asked to learn and draw conclusions.

The Sample

The sample consisted of fifty-eight adults who registered for the Job Dissatisfaction Workshop. For the purposes of the research, all participants were screened to meet the following requirements:

- a) fluent in English
- b) currently employed
- c) able to attend both sessions of the workshop.

Research Questions

This study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. Does the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction assist job dissatisfied adults in specifying their dissatisfactions?
2. What other benefits do participants derive from use of the Q-Sort?
3. Is there one subgroup of job dissatisfied adults for whom the Q-Sort is especially helpful?
4. As reported by the clients, what effect did the Q-Sort have on both participants' attitudes toward their jobs and/or career decisions or plans they had made since using it?

Evaluation of the Data

To assess if and how the data obtained answered the research questions, both quantitative and content analysis were used. In instances where individuals responded by selecting a statement or statements from a series of possible answers, a chi-square was applied to indicate significant response patterns. This statistic made obvious not only those statements which had been selected more often than might have been expected by chance, but also those which had been consistently and significantly omitted. The level of significance was set a priori at $\leq .05$.

In instances where the participants responded with their own comments, suggestions, or plans, the substance of the responses was analyzed, labelled and presented to show the nature and frequency of major response themes.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The results presented in this chapter are divided into five sections. Sample characteristics are presented in the first section and are analyzed descriptively in order to compile as much information about the job dissatisfied clientele as possible. Then data pertinent to each of the four research questions is presented, analyzed descriptively and quantitatively whenever possible, and followed by conclusions.

Sample Characteristics

The total sample consisted of 58 adults (35 females, 23 males). All were employed and had registered for the Job Dissatisfaction Workshop after hearing it and all the other services at the Career Centre described. Their reasons for coming to the Career Centre, grouped according to content and frequency of response, are found in Table 1. The total does not equal 58 because not all participants answered the question.

TABLE 1
REASONS FOR CAREER CENTRE CONTACT

Reason	Frequency
Looking for new occupation/direction	25
Dissatisfied with present job	13
Wanting information about self	4
For professional information and referral	4
Anticipating a job change	3
Wanting confirmation of current career choice	1
Total	50

Tables 2 through 4 describe the sample in terms of age, level of education, and the length of time participants had been employed at their current jobs.

TABLE 2
SAMPLE DESCRIPTION BY AGE

Age	Frequency
17 - 20	1
21 - 25	6
26 - 30	14
31 - 35	12
36 - 40	14
41 - 45	3
46 - 50	3
50+	3
Total	56@

Note: Age range was 20 - 56

@ 2 participants refused to state age

TABLE 3
SAMPLE DESCRIPTION BY EDUCATION

Educational Level	Frequency
Less than grade 12 - no other training	6
Grade 12	7
Up to 2 years post-secondary, including apprenticeships	22
Bachelor's degree	11
2 Bachelor's degrees or graduate work	5
Master's degree	6
PhD	1
Total	58

TABLE 4
EMPLOYMENT AT PRESENT JOB

Length	Frequency
Less than 1 year	6
1 - 5 years	36
6 - 10 years	12
Over 10 years	4
Total	58

Note: Range of employment was 3 months to 25 years

All participants were asked to rate their dissatisfaction with their jobs as one of the following: very dissatisfied, moderately dissatisfied or slightly dissatisfied. Two participants did not answer the question but 13 rated themselves as slightly dissatisfied, 21 as moderately dissatisfied and 22 as very dissatisfied. Using these three descriptors then, the information previously presented can be reorganized to present a profile of each of the three types of dissatisfied client. Table 5 presents a comparison of the demographic information arranged according to the self ratings of level of dissatisfaction.

TABLE 5
COMPARISON OF SLIGHTLY MODERATELY AND VERY DISSATISFIED CLIENTS

Sample Characteristic	Sample Subgroups		
	Slightly Dissatisfied (n=13)	Moderately Dissatisfied (n=21)	Very Dissatisfied (n=22)
Sex			
Male	6	9	8
Female	7	12	14
Age			
17 - 20	0	0	1
21 - 25	0	4	2
26 - 30	4	6	4
31 - 35	2	4	6
36 - 40	4	4	5
41 - 45	0	1	2
46 - 50	1	1	1
51+	1	1	0
Total	12@	21	21@

TABLE 5 (continued)
COMPARISON OF SLIGHTLY MODERATELY AND VERY DISSATISFIED CLIENTS^a

Sample Subgroups			
Sample Characteristic	Slightly Dissatisfied (n=13)	Moderately Dissatisfied (n=21)	Very Dissatisfied (n=22)
Education			
Less than grade 12	0	2	4
Grade 12	0	3	4
Up 2 yr. post sec. or apprenticeship	6	7	8
Bachelor's degree	3	4	3
Graduate work or 2 Bachelor's degrees	1	2	2
Master's	1	3	1
PhD	1	0	0
Total	12@	21	22
Employment			
Less than 1 year	1	0	5
1 - 5 years	9	12	13
6 - 10 years	3	6	4
10+ years	1	3	0
Total	13	21	22

@1 piece data missing

Inspection of Table 5 reveals that in several ways the composition of all three groups is similar. In each group, the majority of participants had up to two years of post secondary education or apprenticeship training. In all three the majority had been employed in their present jobs between one and five years. However there are slight differences on two other variables. While the majority of Slightly and Very Dissatisfied participants (83% and 71% respectively) were between the ages of 26 and 40, that age range included only 64% of the Moderately Dissatisfied. To account for a percentage (81%) similar to the other groups, the age range must be expanded from 21 to 40. Similarly, while the female to male ratio is comparable for the Slightly and Moderately Dissatisfied, it is higher for the Very Dissatisfied.

Additional data about the sample was generated by the ratings given job components (Security, Working Conditions, Compatibility of Personality/Skills With Job, Interpersonal Relationships, Growth and Advancement, Satisfaction With the Work Itself) on the pre-test and post-test.

In both cases participants were asked to use the following rating system:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. very dissatisfied | 4. slightly satisfied |
| 2. moderately dissatisfied | 5. moderately satisfied |
| 3. slightly dissatisfied | 6. very satisfied. |

The pre-test/post-test differences for the entire sample are presented in Table 6 while the pre-test/post-test differences for each of the three groups is given in Tables 7 - 9. All scores are averaged ratings. To

draw attention to the pattern of ratings, the rank order of the components is included.

TABLE 6
COMPONENT RATINGS: ENTIRE SAMPLE

Component	Pre-Test	Rank	Post-Test	Rank
Security	4.14	1	3.95	2
Working Conditions	3.96	2	4.32	1
Personality/Skills Compatibility	3.28	4	3.04	4
Interpersonal Relationships	3.64	3	3.44	3
Growth and Advancement	2.49	6	2.51	6
Satisfaction With Work	2.91	5	2.91	5
Mean	3.40		3.36	

Inspection of this table reveals that after the participants had used the Q-Sort their ratings of two components (Working Conditions, and Growth and Advancement) increased slightly, two decreased and one (Satisfaction With Work) stayed exactly the same. However, the rank order of the components changed with Working Conditions moving from second most highly rated on the pre-test to most highly rated on the post-test. On the other hand, while Growth and Advancement increased in mean rating, it was still ranked last, i.e. providing the least satisfaction. Referring to the rating scale itself indicates that even the highest rated first ranked component reaches only the rating described as "slightly satisfied." The lowest rated and last ranked

component (Growth and Advancement) falls midway between the descriptions "slightly dissatisfied" and "moderately dissatisfied."

TABLE 7
COMPONENT RATINGS: SLIGHTLY DISSATISFIED GROUP

Component	Pre-Test	Rank	Post-Test	Rank
Security	4.50	3	3.67	5
Working Conditions	4.69	1	4.92	1
Personality/Skills Compatibility	4.62	2	3.92	4
Interpersonal Relationships	4.31	4	4.15	2
Growth and Advancement	2.83	6	2.75	6
Satisfaction With Work	3.92	5	4.00	3
Mean	4.15		3.90	

TABLE 8
COMPONENT RATINGS: MODERATELY DISSATISFIED

Component	Pre-Test	Rank	Post-Test	Rank
Security	4.90	1	5.15	1
Working Conditions	4.14	2	4.33	2
Personality/Skills Compatibility	2.95	4	2.67	6
Interpersonal Relationships	3.71	3	3.43	3
Growth and Advancement	2.95	4	2.71	5
Satisfaction With Work	2.62	6	2.81	4
Mean	3.55		3.52	

TABLE 9
COMPONENT RATINGS: VERY DISSATISFIED

Component	Pre-Test	Rank	Post-Test	Rank
Security	3.23	1	3.14	2
Working Conditions	3.09	2	3.95	1
Personality/Skills Compatibility	2.55	4	2.64	4
Interpersonal Relationships	2.91	3	2.73	3
Growth and Advancement	1.77	6	2.27	5
Satisfaction With Work	1.95	5	2.23	6
Mean	2.58		2.82	

Inspection of Tables 7, 8 and 9 shows that participants' ratings of their job components was consistent with their description of their satisfaction with the overall job. Mean scores for the Slightly Dissatisfied group were higher than those of the Moderately Dissatisfied group and they in turn were higher than those of the Very Dissatisfied participants.

While one might expect each group to view the individual components of their jobs somewhat differently, some similarities were also evident. For instance all three groups rated Working Conditions such that among the six components, it consistently ranked first or second. Growth and Advancement, on the other hand, was consistently ranked fifth or sixth by all three groups. After using the Q-Sort, all groups increased their ratings for the components Working Conditions and Satisfaction With the Work but decreased their ratings for Interpersonal Relationships. Further analysis of this data with a t-test for dependent measures could be performed to determine if the component rating changes from pre-test to post-test were significant. However, since this operation would provide a type of data about the instrument which is not specifically needed for the research questions in this thesis, it was not completed.

Research Question One

Does the Q-Sort help people specify their dissatisfactions, i.e. does it help people with generalized feelings of dissatisfaction articulate the specific factors with which they are dissatisfied?

Data to answer this question were gathered in Question 5 of the post-test. Among the eleven statements to which participants could respond were:

- a) Before sorting I felt a general sense of dissatisfaction at work and I still do.
- b) Before sorting I felt a general sense of dissatisfaction at work but after sorting I feel I know better the specific factors that are problems.

It was thought that participants could indicate whether or not the Q-Sort helped them specify a general sense of dissatisfaction by checking one of these responses. Table 10 gives a summary of the responses and an analysis of whether the response pattern might have happened merely by chance.

TABLE 10
RESPONSES RELEVANT TO SPECIFICATION/NON-SPECIFICATION
OF GENERAL DISSATISFACTION

Response Type	Frequency	%	Z
Responded to a	8	14	-5.14
Responded to b	14	24	-3.17
Responded to a + b	17	29	-3.0
Responded to neither a nor b but used other statements	19	33	-2.43

Note: n = 58

$Z \geq 2.58$ at $p \leq .01$

The data show that contrary to the expectation that participants would choose one or the other, 29% of the sample felt that both statements were true for them. However, this phenomenon was not large enough to indicate a finding more significant than what might have occurred by chance.

Conclusions

From the above data it appears that the first research question has not been answered. Contrary to the expectation that participants would use either of the aforementioned statements to indicate how useful the Q-Sort was in specifying general dissatisfaction, it appears by the Z scores that in fact these questions were purposely omitted, or ignored more than might have been expected by chance. With that information, the following conclusions seem worth considering:

- 1) the wording of the statements did not make clear the distinction between them: therefore, some people selected both.
- 2) the assistance provided by the Q-Sort was not perceived as "specification" of their dissatisfaction so participants chose other statements that more aptly described the assistance as they perceived it, eg. clarification.

Research Question Two

What other benefits do participants derive from use of the Q-Sort?

Data to answer this question is drawn from both the post-test and follow-up questionnaire. However, since in both cases the data must be

analyzed descriptively as well as quantitatively, it will be presented in two sections.

Post-Test Data

Data significant to this question were gathered in Question 5 of the post-test and includes both a frequency count of responses to statements 1 - 10 and a summary of responses to the open-ended statement, "For me other benefits of using the Q-Sort were . . ."

Before considering the frequency of responses, it is necessary to note that not all statements to which participants could respond were viewed by the writer to be "benefits." So that participants would also have an avenue to report that the Q-Sort did not help them, statements indicating confusion, continued generalized feelings of dissatisfaction, etc., were included. Statements seen as expressing a benefit for the client are those which indicate gains in information (knew some specific problems and have found more) or shift in perspective (found I liked my job more than I thought I did). Table 11 indicates the frequency of responses to both types of statements and an evaluation of whether that frequency represents more than what might be expected by chance. For the sake of table format, responses have been reduced from full statements to phrases.

TABLE 11

PARTICIPANT PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF Q-SORT ON POST-TEST

Response Type	Frequency	%	Z
<u>Responses Indicate No Benefit</u>			
Knew my problems, did not learn anything new	11	19	-4.43
Felt general dissatisfaction and still do	25	43	-1.00
Factors troubling me did not appear in Q-Sort	14	24	-3.71
Feel more confused about my dissatisfaction than before	1	2	-6.86
<u>Responses Indicate Benefit</u>			
Felt general dissatisfaction but now know specific problems	31	53	0.43
Confirmed my ideas	31	53	0.43
Knew some specific problems and have found more	34	59	1.29
Learned I liked my job more than I thought	9	16	-4.86
Found more likes than dislikes about my job	17	29	-3.00

TABLE 11 (CONTINUED)
PARTICIPANT PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF Q-SORT ON POST-TEST

Response Type	Frequency	%	Z
<u>Responses Indicate Benefit</u>			
Forced to think about my priorities	42	72	3.14*

*Z is significant at .01

Note: $Z \geq 2.58$ at $p \leq .01$

Inspection of Table 11 indicates that only one statement (the Q-Sort really forced me to think about my priorities) was selected by enough participants to be considered significant, and that, in fact, it is considered a statement indicating benefit as defined by the writer.

Among the sample of 58, 24 participants completed the open-ended questions, "For me other benefits of the Q-Sort were . . ." Summarized according to content, their answers refer to the "other benefits" gained as follows:

- 1) specific insights or findings about specific elements of the job or their satisfaction (4 responses).
eg. "I found my job satisfaction more important than job security."
eg. "Security seemed important (surprisingly!). Interpersonal relationships seems of some concern which I hadn't thought of before."
- b) changes in attitudes, thoughts and feelings (4 responses).
eg. "Actually changed my attitude to a more positive one--could see I had more control over how I felt about my work."

c) increased awareness of self, and of self as compared with other working people (4 responses).

eg. "Self analysis, better understanding of myself."

eg. "Workshop setting increases awareness that others often feel uncomfortable in their jobs."

Eight of the participants simply stated their opinions that the Q-Sort had provided focus, clarification and confirmation.

eg. "Focusing on areas--emotions, relationships, etc.--helped clarify."

eg. "Confirming present knowledge and that I am on the right track."

At least one person commented on the method used as "a systematic way to look at a wider variety of factors than I had previously considered."

Conclusion

From the data gathered one week after participants used the Q-Sort, there appear to be at least four other benefits from using the Q-Sort. The benefit revealed from the quantitative data is that the Q-Sort forces people to think about their priorities in a job. The benefits revealed by the comments of the users are:

- 1) changes in attitudes, thoughts or feelings about one's job and one's self.
- 2) increased awareness of one's self, and of one's self as compared to other working people.

- 3) learning a method for systematic study of the factors to be considered about one's job.

Follow-up Data

Since the follow-up questionnaire was structured to parallel the post-test, Table 12 indicates the frequency of response to both statements which represent a benefit and those which do not.

TABLE 12
PARTICIPANT PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF Q-SORT ON FOLLOW-UP

Response Type	Frequency	%	Z
<u>Responses Indicate No Benefit</u>			
Did not help me at all	0	0	-6.25
Confused me	2	6	-5.5
<u>Responses Indicate Benefit</u>			
Confirmed problems I suspected	27	84	4.25*
Uncovered additional problems	14	44	-0.75
Clarified problems	20	63	1.63
Showed more likes than I suspected	15	47	-0.38
Showed more likes than dislikes	7	22	-3.50
Helped me set priorities	19	59	1.13

*Z sig. at .01

Note: $Z \geq 2.58$ at $p \leq .01$

Note: N = 32

Inspection of Table 12 reveals that after 4 - 6 weeks the participants perceived the major benefit of use of the Q-Sort to be the confirmation of problems they had already suspected.

Six of the group that returned follow-up questionnaires added their own responses to the list. While two of the responses pertain more to the entire two-session workshop, the following appear to refer specifically to the Q-Sort:

- 1) Interesting.
- 2) Made me more clearly aware of what and where my interests are.
- 3) Not only helped put my problems in perspective with my total situation but with those of other people.
- 4) The Q-Sort assigned words to my dissatisfaction and presented a framework to help me understand the likes and dislikes of my job.

Conclusion

From data gathered 4 to 6 weeks after participants used the Q-Sort, one benefit can be singled out as significant. That benefit is the confirmation of problems already suspected by the worker.

Research Question Three

Is there one subgroup of the three subgroups (Very Dissatisfied, Moderately Dissatisfied, Slightly Dissatisfied) for whom the Q-Sort is especially helpful?

Data from both the post-test and follow-up questionnaire will be used to answer the question. Table 13 provides the post-test perceptions of benefits of the Q-Sort by subgroup while Table 14 provides the follow-up data according to subgroup.

TABLE 13
PERCEPTION OF Q-SORT BENEFITS ON POST-TEST BY SUBGROUP

Response Type	SUBGROUPS								
	Slightly Dissatisfied (n=13)			Moderately Dissatisfied (n=11)			Very Dissatisfied (n=22)		
	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z
<u>Responses Indicate No Benefit</u>									
Knew my problems, did not learn anything new	0	-	-	5	24	-2.36	5	23	-2.45
Felt general dissatisfaction and still do	6	46	-.29	2	10	-3.64	16	73	2.09*
Factors troubling me did not appear on Q-Sort	3	23	-1.93	3	14	-3.27	5	23	-2.45
Feel more confused about my dissatisfaction than before	-	-	-	1	5	-4.09	-	-	-
<u>Responses Indicate Benefit</u>									
Felt general dissatisfaction but now know specific problems	7	54	.29	12	57	.64	13	59	.82
Confirmed my ideas	7	54	.29	11	52	.18	13	59	.82
Knew some specific problems and have found more	8	62	.86	13	62	1.09	14	64	1.45

TABLE 13 (Continued)
PERCEPTION OF Q-SORT BENEFITS ON POST-TEST BY SUBGROUP

Response Type	SUBGROUPS								
	Slightly Dissatisfied (n=13)			Moderately Dissatisfied (n=11)			Very Dissatisfied (n=22)		
	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z
<u>Responses Indicate Benefit</u>									
Learned I liked my job more									
than I thought	2	15	-2.5	6	29	-1.91	0	-	-
Found more likes than dislikes									
about my job	8	62	.86	8	38	-1.09	0	-	-
Forced me to consider									
priorities	10	77	1.93	16	76	2.36*	15	68	1.63

*Z_≥ 1.96 significant at p ≤ .05

This breakdown of information indicates that a significant number of Moderately Dissatisfied people felt the Q-Sort forced them to think about their priorities. That is regarded by the author as a positive finding for the group. In contrast is the fact that the only significantly rated response for the Very Dissatisfied group is in the category of responses indicating the Q-Sort is not helpful. Neither type of response was chosen more than could have been expected by chance by the Slightly Dissatisfied group.

TABLE 14
PERCEPTION OF Q-SORT BENEFITS ON FOLLOW-UP BY SUBGROUP

Response Type	SUBGROUPS								
	Slightly Dissatisfied (n=9)			Moderately Dissatisfied (n=11)			Very Dissatisfied (n=10)		
	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z	Fre- que- ncy	%	Z
<u>Responses Indicate No Benefit</u>									
Did not help me	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
Confused me	0	-	-	1	9	-2.73	0	-	-
<u>Responses Indicate Benefit</u>									
Confirmed problems I suspected	7	78	1.65	9	82	2.13*	9	90	2.5*
Uncovered additional problems	5	56	.294	4	36	-.93	4	40	-.63
Clarified problems	6	67	1	6	67	1.13	7	70	1.25
Showed more likes than I suspected	5	56	.294	5	45	-0.33	2	20	-1.88
Showed more likes than dislikes	5	56	.294	3	27	-1.53	0	-	-
Helped me set priorities	8	89	2.29*	6	67	1.13	6	60	.625

*Z $\geq$ 1.96 significant at $p \leq .05$

After 4 - 6 weeks it appears that the Very Dissatisfied groups' perceptions of the usefulness of the Q-Sort have changed dramatically. Instead of indicating no benefit was derived from the Q-Sort as they did

on the post-test, they have now chosen one response (confirmed problems I suspected) that is both positive and significant at the .05 level. The Moderately Dissatisfied group has again reacted significantly to one statement of benefit (confirmed problems I suspected) but it is not the same one they chose on the post-test. The Slightly Dissatisfied group, which did not indicate any significant benefit on the post-test, now pinpoint the help they received in setting priorities as a major benefit.

Conclusion

Data from both the post-test and follow-up show that it is not possible to conclude that any one sub-group derived the most benefit from the Q-Sort because:

- 1) each group obtained at least one significant benefit
- 2) it is not the intent of this author to suggest that one benefit is of greater worth than another.

It is more useful to note that:

- a) the amount of time that has passed since use of the Q-Sort may change the user's perception of the benefit s/he derived from it. For instance, after 1 week the Moderately Dissatisfied felt the major benefit of the Q-Sort was its helping them set priorities, yet 4 - 6 weeks later they responded that its major benefit was in confirming what they had already suspected.
- b) the attitude of participants in two groups seemed more positive regarding the Q-Sort as time passed. Both the Very Dissatisfied and the Slightly Dissatisfied groups changed from reporting no benefit

after one week to reporting one significant benefit after 4 - 6 weeks.

- c) the benefits most often mentioned were the confirmation of previous suspicions about one's job and help in setting priorities. The confirmation of previous suspicions was chosen by both the Very and Moderately Dissatisfied on the follow-up questionnaire. The setting of priorities benefit was chosen by the Moderately Dissatisfied on the post-test, and for the Slightly Dissatisfied was chosen frequently but not significantly ($Z = 1.93$) on the post-test, and significantly on the follow-up.

Research Question Four

As reported by the clients, what effect did the Q-Sort have on both participant attitudes toward their jobs and on career decisions or plans they had made since using it?

Data to answer this question was gathered exclusively from the follow-up questionnaire. With regard to the effect of the Q-Sort on attitudes toward their jobs, participants were asked two questions. On the first, (Question #2) they rated, on a scale of 1 to 5, the effect of using the Q-Sort. With a rating of 1 indicating "no effect," and a rating of 5 indicating "a great deal" of effect, the mean rating of 3.17 for the 24 respondents indicates that the Q-Sort did have some effect on attitude toward the job. However, the direction of the effect, that is whether people felt more positively, more negatively or just differently toward their jobs cannot be determined from this rating.

The second question (Question 3C) asked with regard to the effect of use of the Q-Sort on attitudes toward their jobs simply required the respondent to work out his/her own comment. The following is a summary of the content of the answers with an indication of the frequency of each.

1. Articulated what I suspected (10 responses)
2.
 - a. Clarified or specified the problems (9 responses)
 - b. Clarified the positives and negatives (2 responses)
3.
 - a. Put problems in perspective, i.e. showed the negatives and positives about my job (1 response)
 - b. Put my problem in perspective with other people's (1 response)
4. Helped me set priorities (1 response)
5. Increased my discomfort with my job (1 response)
6. Brought out areas of my job I was not thinking about (1 response)

The majority of these comments seem to speak more to how the Q-Sort helped the participants than how it affected their attitudes to their jobs. They seem almost to provide information more relevant to Research Question 2 which sought the types of benefits a user might obtain from the Q-Sort. However, there are at least two answers (3a and b) which indicate the perspective of the user was altered and it may not be too daring to assume that a change in perspective may be/affect/cause a change in attitude.

In an attempt to ascertain, at least according to the user, if the Q-Sort might have affected the user's career decisions or plans, two questions were asked. First, the participants were asked what career decisions or plans they had made since using the Q-Sort. The following

is a summary of their responses:

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Quit my job | 1 response |
| 2. Sought more counselling | 2 responses |
| 3. Decided to stay at present job | |
| a) feel more satisfied | 2 responses |
| b) will work on problem areas | 8 responses |
| c) will look/plan for a new job | 8 responses |
| d) will look/plan for a new occupation | 2 responses |
| e) will look at other ways to satisfy "wants" | 1 response |
| f) will plan retirement | 3 responses |
| g) will plan more education | 2 responses |
| 4. None | 1 response |

The second question asked participants was how the Q-Sort results had influenced their plans or decisions. Grouped according to content the answers are as follows:

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| a) confirmed what I knew | 6 responses |
| b) clarified problems | 6 responses |
| c) increased confidence in my own thinking | 5 responses |
| d) increased awareness: of myself | 1 response |
| : of good aspects of my job | 3 responses |
| : of what cannot be changed | 2 responses |
| e) gave me a focus/sense of direction | 2 responses |
| f) gave me a clearer method of looking at
potential jobs to avoid problems | 2 responses |
| g) see my job in a "different light" | 1 response |

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|------------|
| h) | showed alternatives to quitting | 1 response |
| i) | crystallized a half-made decision | 1 response |

While some of the answers (a, b, d, g, and h) seem to suggest the Q-Sort helped increase or verify the information base used in the decision-making process, the other answers do suggest a more active effect. For instance, increased confidence in one's thinking will likely promote speedier and firmer decisions. Having a clearer method for evaluation implies a more efficient decision-making process and perhaps more confidence in the final decision. The statement "crystallized a half-made decision" seems to indicate an awakening to the fact that some decision-making process had already begun. No doubt once that realization occurred, the participant would continue the process in a more conscious and active manner.

Conclusion

While the answers to Research Question Four must be viewed in terms of a) the limitations of subject self-report and b) the variety of contaminating influences the subject was subjected to before answering the questions, they are at least an attempt to explore whether or not the influence of the Q-Sort extended beyond the workshop itself to the day-to-day world of the worker. From the data gathered, use of the Q-Sort appears to have some influence on attitudes toward the immediate job. The effect on attitude seems most likely to have come from a broadening of the workers' perspectives about their jobs. Several mention seeing the positives as well as the negatives in their own jobs and having compared themselves with other people. For people who have been focusing

on only the negatives of their jobs, a fresh appreciation for the positives might alone be enough to change attitudes.

With regard to the effect of the Q-Sort on actual career decisions or plans, the data are less clear. Most of the participants indicate they have decided to remain at their jobs where they will either work on improving the problem areas or begin planning/looking for a new job. However, given the present lack of job opportunities in our depressed economy, it seems likely there are more serious factors than the Q-Sort influencing this decision.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The preceding chapter lists some of the statistical and descriptive findings of this study. Required now is a more interpretive discussion of those findings and their implications for career counseling. Included in this chapter as well are recommendations about the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction and the use of other Q-Sorts, and some suggestions for further research.

Discussion

While conclusions based solely on the research data were presented with the data in Chapter IV, it was immediately apparent to the writer that there were still other ways of analyzing the data, and other information she had gathered by participation and observation of these groups that could be shared with the reader.

The data gathered for Research Question One, for instance, indicated that participants did not choose either statement significantly often and did surprise the writer by choosing both statements 29% of the time. Aside from the first conclusion about unclear wording, however, the writer has heard/observed clients who felt that while some of the elements of their sense of general dissatisfaction had been specified, others had not. Discussion with these people revealed that their problems required a level of specification beyond this Q-Sort. A salesman, for example, agreed that the source of his overall problem was

the company's management policy but was unable to find in the cards the specific problem of "no clearly developed marketing strategy." For him, both statements about the Q-Sort seemed at least partially true.

In a more speculative vein, the writer suspects that for some people who claimed they still felt a "general sense of dissatisfaction about work," further analysis of the situation might reveal that the "sense of general dissatisfaction" pertained not only to work but to other aspects of their lives as well. Since the Q-Sort refers only to one's job, it cannot help someone who is generally unhappy but not yet able to separate unhappiness at work from unhappiness in other parts of his/her life. However, on occasion the examination of the job assists people in further self-examination. This was the case with one participant who concluded her problem was not her job, but rather her own lack of confidence and assertiveness in approaching her co-workers on the job.

With reference to conclusions to Research Question Two, it appears that by looking only at data indicating significant benefits, one overlooks much other meaningful information. For instance, the high negative Z scores for those statements that indicate no benefit seem to suggest that participants deliberately ignored these statements. If participants did this because they were inaccurate statements, perhaps one can speculate that there is a positive side to each of the "no benefit" statements. This writer would speculate that participants did not find the Q-Sort or its results confusing at all and that no matter how well, generally or specifically, they understood their dissatisfaction, they saw Q-Sorting as a learning experience. The high

negative Z scores for two of the statements indicating benefits (learned I liked my job more than I thought and found more likes than dislikes about my job) might be taken as evidence to support the notion that the Q-Sort confirmed for people ideas/problems they had suspected.

Extreme caution must be taken when interpreting any of the data from the follow-up questionnaire because contamination of perceptions about the Q-Sort from the second session was both expected and observed. Furthermore, since only 32 of the original sample of 58 returned their follow-up questionnaires, the possibility of a particular bias being emphasized also exists. For instance, the follow-up data to Research Question Two indicated the respondents perceived only one major benefit. Using sample numbers alone it should be noted that 31 of the original 58 indicated on the post-test that the Q-Sort had confirmed what they suspected but it is only when twenty-seven of the 32 follow-up questionnaires reported this finding that it became a response of statistical significance. While this writer does not wish to discredit a significant finding, she feels that it must be viewed with caution because if only those people who had positive perceptions of the Q-Sort returned their follow-ups, this response bias itself could be responsible for the statistical result.

The problem of response bias must be recognized when considering the follow-up data used to answer Research Question Three as well. While on the Post-test the Very Dissatisfied group ($n = 22$) responded significantly often with a "no benefit" type of response, the 10 people who returned their follow-ups responded positively. The data for the Moderately Dissatisfied group appear to be the most reliable because 100%

of that subgroup returned their follow-ups. While 9 of the 13 Slightly Dissatisfied group returned their follow-ups, their responses pattern seems to be stable and the response (forced me to consider priorities) which reached statistical significance on the follow-up had in fact been very close ($Z = 1.93$) to significance on the post-test. The conclusions to Research Question Three should be restated as follows:

1. people with different levels of dissatisfaction report different benefits from use of the Q-Sort. The Moderately Dissatisfied, for instance, reported the Q-Sort confirmed problems they had already suspected while the Slightly Dissatisfied group felt the Q-Sort helped them set priorities.
2. perception of the benefits of using the Q-Sort changed between the post-test and the follow-up questionnaire. For the Moderately Dissatisfied group, for instance, the change was from seeing the significant benefit as assistance in setting priorities to seeing the confirmation of suspected problems as the major benefit. However, this change cannot be attributed simply to the passage of time. Given the context of the second session and the nature of the perceptions reported, the writer feels sure contamination of perceptions of the Q-Sort by the discussions in the second session has occurred.
3. the benefits most often mentioned were the confirmation of previous suspicions about one's job and help in setting priorities. However, it appears that these benefits cannot be attributed solely to the Q-Sort (only one reached significance on the post-test). Even though

the follow-up questions asked respondents to distinguish between the Q-Sorting session and the second session, the responses to the open-ended questions indicate this was difficult for many of the participants. Therefore, until further uncontaminated data on the Q-Sort itself was gathered, the aforementioned benefits should be attributed to the whole two-session workshop.

Keeping in mind that the second session of the workshop dealt with strategies for assessing the nature of the dissatisfactions and then dealing with them, the writer believes the data gathered to answer the fourth question are also blatantly contaminated. That so many participants report they have decided to stay at their jobs and work on the problem areas seems obviously related to the exercises and strategies suggested. However, the original question was about the effects of the Q-Sort on attitude and while the "effects" to be discussed cannot be attributed only to the Q-Sort, it appears they do respond to the question. Reviewing the responses to the open-ended question about attitude, for instance, one notices that the respondents mention not only the negative but also the positive factors of their jobs were either clarified or put in perspective. The writer recalls, however, that when these people introduced themselves at the beginning of the workshop, few could identify more than two factors at work which were still satisfying for them. Most of these people said they had originally contacted the Career Centre because they were looking for a new occupation or direction (and, implicit in that is a job change) so the response that at least one quarter of the respondents were focusing on solving their work problems indicates a definite shift in attitude. An equal number report they will

stay at their jobs while actively planning and seeking new ones but given that a full one third of those followed-up had originally described themselves as Very Dissatisfied, i.e. almost ready to quit, this too seems to indicate a change in attitude. Only one person actually did quit and he had originally described himself as Very Dissatisfied.

What is the real impact of the Q-Sort then? Recognizing the contamination from the second session, the writer noted informal client comments that might be relevant to that question. She asked, during a group discussion, if the workshop could have been as successful without using the Q-Sort at all. The responses were a unanimous, "NO." The reason given was that the Q-Sort provided the structure for revealing both the negatives and positives, suggesting the relationships among them and providing a basis from which problem solving could begin. The overall effect on attitude seemed to be positive, perhaps because the participants then felt they were seeing the whole picture, and since both negatives and positives were evident, were seeing it more "objectively" than they had before. Having some of their ideas confirmed built up their confidence in themselves. Furthermore, the Q-Sort provided a detailed list of problems which could be systematically attacked. In most cases, the movement from a feeling of confusion or frustration to one of being able to see each problem clearly enough to attempt solving it was positive.

Implications for Career Counseling

There are at least two significant implications for career counseling in these findings. The first is pertinent to the issue of whether or not job dissatisfied adults are "special" clients and thus require a service differing from that required by other types of career planners. The second is about the usefulness of the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction for counseling job dissatisfied adults.

To determine whether a job dissatisfied adult is a unique type of career planner, one might first ask, "What is a typical career planner?" Given the definitions currently in use, a career planner is anyone making a career decision, that is, a decision about his/her job, occupation, education or lifestyle. The person may or may not be employed. A job dissatisfied adult is, however, by definition, employed and unhappy with some or all aspects of the job. While in some cases the person says s/he feels a need for change, s/he may not be clear about whether a job or an occupational change is necessary. In many cases the person feels s/he simply cannot make either a job or occupational change and wants ideas to help survive what seems a dreadful trap.

It is within these two descriptors of job dissatisfied adults that the nature of their uniqueness is apparent. First of all, one must not assume that because a need for change is perceived, that either a job or occupational change may be necessary. It is entirely possible that a change within the job, or within the person, or within the connection between his/her job and lifestyle could solve the problem. Therefore the service required is one which can provide a structure for analysis of the

problem and the kinds of changes needed. If the result of this process is a decision on the part of the adult to choose a job or an occupational change, then the person can be classified as a "typical" career planner. For those dissatisfied clients who cannot leave their jobs, the requirement for an analysis of the problems and strategies for dealing with such problems is perfectly clear. Again this indicates a special service. The strategies devised for job search, occupational change or lifestyle planning are simply not relevant.

Perhaps the most significant comment to all of the above is that, in fact, there are no "typical" or "atypical" types of career planners. There are, instead, types of decisions that have to be made and therefore types of services to be developed to assist with those decisions. The decision to seek help in solving or easing problems at work simply requires a service different from the decision to seek help with mounting a sophisticated job search or the decision to investigate alternative occupations. Furthermore, it must be noted that the services required for the last two decisions are, in fact, two very distinct ones, no more similar to each other than to that developed for the job dissatisfied.

Regarding the usefulness of the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction for counseling dissatisfied workers, this investigation of client perceptions indicates that the Q-Sort is an excellent tool for beginning the counseling process. It provides a structure for identifying both the satisfactions and dissatisfactions and by doing so widens the client's perspectives about his job and refocuses the attention of the client from just the problems to the whole job. It builds confidence in the client who sees his/her thinking confirmed on paper and thus motivates the

client to attempt further problem solving. The structured nature of the Q-Sort presents an organized framework for analyzing a job and participants feel they learn from it. However, the Q-Sort must be coupled with further individual or group interaction because dissatisfied workers seeking counseling always follow the question, "What is going wrong?" with, "What can I do about it?" While the Q-Sort helps answer the first question, it was not designed to deal with the second. Unless the second is addressed, however, the client's needs have not been recognized and thus, the full counseling process cannot be seen to have been undertaken.

Concequence of Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction with Current Theories

While the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction has received a positive evaluation by users, a positive rating in terms of its congruence with current theories about job satisfaction/dissatisfaction would be welcomed. After extensive use of the Q-Sort, this writer feels that in fact the context and structure of the Q-Sort is not only very congruent with the theories reviewed earlier but also has the potential to strengthen some of the weak areas of each as identified by Locke.

Beginning with the job facets theories, this writer believes that the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction includes the major facets (except "organization") listed by Lodahl (1964) and the major dimensions (except "company and management") summarized by Locke (1976). The structure of the Q-Sort, however, has allowed several of what Locke and Lodahl saw as independent dimensions (pay, benefits) to be grouped together in the

cluster dealing with security issues. Similarly, whereas Locke sees supervision and co-workers as two distinct dimensions, the Q-Sort represents them as two types of Interpersonal Relationships. The economy of those two groupings allowed the addition of the dimensions Satisfaction With Work and Compatibility of Skills/Personality With Job. While there is no written rationale as to why and how these dimensions were chosen, they do in fact include many of the items used in the Atkinson (1983) study. That they do seem relevant to contemporary research into job satisfaction simply underscores Locke's belief that the method requires the goals of the researcher to be clear enough that the dimensions to be studied can be conceptualized clearly, too. That the dimensions are not the same now as they were twenty years ago very probably indicates that indeed the overall societal conceptualization of the nature of work has changed.

In terms of Locke's major criticisms of expectancy theories, the Q-Sort method for studying satisfaction/dissatisfaction shows some real strengths. First of all, it allows the person's hierarchy of values to be represented clearly, and provides a structure for seeing how those values are related. Secondly, it allows the person to indicate what s/he feels s/he is currently obtaining at work and thus the discrepancy between what is highly valued and what is being obtained. Those discrepancies can be analyzed item by item or on a cluster by cluster basis. Hence this method approaches Locke's ideal of making obvious both the amount of the value wanted and how much the person wants it.

At first glance, it appears that much of the content of Maslow's theory is contained in this Q-Sort. It is reasonable to assume that an

adult capable of functioning in the workplace is capable of meeting his/her basic physiological needs via the items referring to economic security. However, the self-actualization end of the hierarchy is more difficult to locate. As Locke (1976) comments, the term is nowhere defined clearly. In terms of work, could it mean high interest, or intellectual stimulation, or freedom to use one's imagination and creativity? If so, it is covered in our Q-Sort. However, maybe this concept cannot or should not be narrowed to the working portion of a persons' life, but applied to the lifestyle as a whole. Is it not possible that much dissatisfaction with work may be due to the realization that it does not necessarily provide the most important happiness in one's life? Perhaps self-actualization is an unrealistic expectation of the workplace.

The content of Herzberg's theory, being more work related in design, is easier to compare to the content of the Q-Sort. Except for one facet, company policies, in Herzberg's content, there is perfect congruence between the two. However, as was the case with both facet and process theories, the content theories have sustained criticism. The major one is with the notion of either needs, or motivators/hygiences being arranged according to a hierarchy, and operating in a unidirectional manner. The Q-Sort provides the flexibility to overcome this problem. The sorter arranges the content according to his/her own hierarchy of values, and is independent of any theory "musts" or "shoulds." No one level must be reacted to before another can receive attention, and not all items with any one cluster are considered of equal importance. When

discrepancies are examined, it is assumed they can be anywhere within the fifty-four items and do exist independent of all other factors. Interestingly enough, the most often stated sources of dissatisfaction, advancement and supervision, are both motivators.

Recommendations

Recommendations resulting from this investigation are of two types: those pertinent to the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction and those pertinent to the use of Q-Sorts in general. Regarding the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction, it is recommended that:

1. further research into the overall structure of the tool is warranted. However, the first step in this research should be a more thorough conceptualization of the job dimensions to be included in the instrument. There is, for example, a lack of clarity about the component currently labelled "Compatibility of Skills/ Personality With the Job." A clearer conceptualization of what is being studied in this component might indicate a) a need for two components dealing with skills and personality separately, b) a rationale for why this component should remain as it is, or c) a new label or title for the component. At present no rationale, with reasons for the inclusion of some components and exclusion of many others noted in the research, has been provided.
2. further research and development of item content is warranted. User comments indicate that some items are vague and easily misunderstood (eg. I can meet the demands of my job) while others are so similar as to make discrimination between them difficult (eg. I have

permanent employment and I have steady income). It is also possible that with more clearly conceptualized job dimensions the number of items required to represent the concept may change. Since this Q-Sort is not large, its entire size in terms of both factors and items bears re-examination.

3. use of the Q-Sort of Job Satisfaction with employed but dissatisfied adults be continued as a part of the counseling process. The benefits mentioned in the preceding section and the writer's observations suggest this is a very effective tool for identifying problems and providing a framework for further discussion and action.

Regarding the use of Q-Sorts in general, it is recommended that:

- a) the many benefits of using Q-Sorts be considered when exercises or instruments are being developed for adult users. The Q-Sort format seems especially helpful when information has to be arranged according to priorities. The adults in this study said they could not have organized the job related information presented them either as easily or as meaningfully if it had been presented in the usual rank-order type exercise on paper. They reported both enjoying and benefitting from the manipulation and visual organization of the cards. It was also evident that structuring their answers without regard to preconceived ideas was easier when they were holding a pack of cards than when scanning a list of statements.
- b) the procedure of examining item by item discrepancies be given as much consideration as the calculation of the overall correlation of

the two sorts. In this particular study the most meaningful information and action resulted from the client's confronting and considering the discrepancies between his/her real job and its ideal description on an item-by-item basis. The greatest increases in personal awareness came from seeing one's priorities not only on paper and in relation to each other, but as compared to what was currently being obtained. While an overall correlation of the two sorts could have been computed it could neither have replaced nor enhanced these user gains.

Suggestions for Further Research

Among the data generated by this study were at least two issues that this writer feels warrant further research. The first arose from the finding that the majority of the dissatisfied workers had been at their present jobs between one and five years. Since their ages indicate they had likely been working for longer than five years, one wonders if in fact they had quite recently made a job change as their first attempt to deal with dissatisfaction. If that is so, a host of questions could be asked. What was the dissatisfaction in the previous job? Was the job change a straight job change or was it also an occupational change? If it was a straight job change, how did the employee attempt to prevent the old dissatisfactions occurring in the new job? Are the dissatisfactions now the same ones previously experienced?

The second issue is associated with one of the major sources of dissatisfaction, namely lack of advancement. Unfortunately the concept of advancement seems rather narrowly defined as either an increase in

salary or a promotion to a higher position on an organizational chart. This writer feels that valuable contributions to our understanding of job satisfaction would be produced by more thorough and widespread research into a) worker's definitions of advancement and b) the effect of exposure to a broader definition of advancement. It is this writer's perception that when a worker was challenged to think of advancement as including development of skills, addition of responsibilities, increased professional respect, assignments to train or supervise younger people entering the profession as well or instead of monetary and structural rewards, there was often a shift in attitude. If the direction and nature of this shift was better understood, another strategy for easing dissatisfaction, at least with the concepts of promotions and advancement, should be apparent.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower. Career Development in Alberta.
Edmonton, Alberta: Career Resources Branch, 1981.
- Atkinson, T. Changing attitudes toward work in Canada. *The Canadian Business Review*, 1981, Spring, 39-51.
- Barkley, M. V. Adaptation of the Q-Sort technique as an evaluation device. *Illinois Teacher*, 1975, 38, 4, 206-207.
- Bess, J. L. Intrinsic satisfaction from academic versus other professional work: a comparative analysis. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- Block, J. A comparison of the forced and unforced Q-Sorting procedures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1956, XVI, 481-493.
- Bormann, E. G., et al. Political cartoons and salient rhetorical fantasies: an empirical analysis of the '76 presidential campaign. *Communication Monographs*, 1978, 45, 4, 317-329.
- Brown, S. R. The forced free distribution in Q-technique. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1971, 8, 283-287.
- Burns, E; Jenkins, E. Stability of Q-Sorts in assessing descriptions of hyperactivity. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1975, 40, 3, 694.
- Cottle, C. E.; McKeown, B. The forced-free distinction in Q-technique: a note on unused categories in the Q-Sort continuum. *Operant Subjectivity*, 1980, 3, 2, 58-63.
- Davidson, C. V.; Tippet, L. G. A Career Planning Guide. Hull, Quebec, Canada: Printing and Publishing, Supply Services Canada, 1978.

- Debb, G. S.; Alexander, B. K. An automated procedure for correlation of Q-sorts. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1977, 45, 3, 1264-1266.
- Dunlap, W. R. A fortran computer program for Q-sort calculations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 1978, 38, 1, 195-196.
- Dunnette, M. D.; Campbell, J. P.; Hakel, M. D. Factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in six occupational groups. University of Minnesota, Mimeo, 1966.
- Edwards, A. L. Social desirability and Q-sorts. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1955, 19, 6, 462.
- Edwards, A. L.; Horst, P. Social desirability as a variable in Q-technique studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1953, 13, 4, 620-625.
- Frataccia, E. V.; Hennington, I. Satisfaction of hygiene and motivator needs of teachers who resigned from teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Southwest Education Research Association, Austin, Texas, 1982, 1-15.
- Gabel, L. L. The development of a model to determine perceptions of scientific literacy. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1976, 1-337.
- Green, B. F. Note on Bem and Funder's scheme for scoring Q-sorts. *Psychological Review*, 1980, 87, 2, 212-214.
- Gutman, J. Television viewer types: a Q analysis *Journal of Broadcasting*, 1978, 22, 4, 505-515.

- Housego, B. E. J.; Boldt, W. B. Priorities of teacher behaviors as perceived by student teachers in a school based program: an exploratory study. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 1978, 24, 1, 53-65.
- Hulin, C. L. Individual differences and job enrichment: the case against general treatments. In J. R. Maher (Ed.) *New Perspectives in Job Enrichment*, New York: Van Nostrand, 1971, 159-191.
- Hulin, C. L.; Blood, M. R. Job enlargement, individual differences and worker responses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1968, 69, 41-55.
- Jensen, M. D. Using the Q-sort to identify non-verbal perceptions. *Communication Education*, 1979, 28, 2, 150-152.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York; Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Q Methodology in Behavioral Research. In S. Brown and D. Brenner (Eds.), Science, Psychology and Communication: Essays Honoring William Stephenson. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.
- Lawler, E. E. and Suttle, J. L. A causal correlational test of the need hierarchy concept. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1972, 7, 265-287.
- Livson, N. H.; Nichols, T. F. Discrimination and reliability in Q-sort personality descriptions. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1956, 52, 159-165.
- Locke, E. A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

- Lodahl, T. M. Patterns of job attitudes in two assembly technologies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, March, 1964, 8, 4.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Metzger, A. M. A Q-methodological study of the Kubler-Ross stage theory. *Journal of Death and Dying*, 1979-80, 10, 4, 291-301.
- Neff, W. S.; Helfand, A. A Q-sort instrument to assess the meaning of work. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1963, 10, 2, 139-145.
- Nitzberg, M. C. Development of a modified Q-sort instrument to measure priorities adolescent places on developmental tasks. *Adolescence*, 1980, 15, 59, 501-508.
- Peterson, K. Self-concept and behavior perception changes of student teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 1980, 5, 4, 41-50.
- Peterson, K; Yaakobi, D. Peterson-Yaakobi Q-sort manual. 1978.
- Robinson, J. P.; Athansion, R.; and Head, K. B. Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.
- Rozsnafszky, J. The relationship of level of ego development to Q-sort personality ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1981, 41, 1, 99-120.
- Schneider, J.; Locke, E. A. A critique of Herzberg's incident classification system and a suggested revision. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1971, 6, 441-457.
- Staines, G. L. Is worker dissatisfaction rising? *Challenge*, 1979, May-June, 38-45.

- Stephenson, W. The study of behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- _____. Old age research in England. *Operant Subjectivity*, 1978, 2, 2, 46-50.
- _____. Applications of communication theory: IV Immediate Experiences of Movies. *Operant Subjectivity*, 1978, 1, 4, 96-116.
- Sutnick, M. R. The Q-sort technique applied to nutrition attitudes investigation. *Journal of Nutrition Education*, 1981, 13, 1, 102-105.
- Viteles, M. S. Industrial Psychology. New York: W. W. Norton, 1953.
- Vroom, V. H. Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Wittenborn, J. R. Contributions and current status of Q methodology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1961, 58, 132-142.

APPENDIX A
EXAMINING JOB DISSATISFACTION #1

EXAMINING JOB DISSATISFACTION #1

NAME _____ DATE _____

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL _____

AGE _____

PRESENT JOB TITLE _____

LENGTH OF TIME AT PRESENT JOB _____

1. What was your original reason for coming to the Career Centre?

2. Have you or are you using any other service at the Career Centre as well as the Job Dissatisfaction Workshop?

3. You have stated you are dissatisfied with your present job. Check the statement that best described your dissatisfaction.

_____	very dissatisfied (almost ready to quit)
_____	moderately dissatisfied (almost as many negative as positive aspects about the job)
_____	slightly dissatisfied (there are a few factors you'd like changed)

Now consider the various components of your job and rate your satisfaction/dissatisfaction with each:

Using the following scale:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 very dissatisfied | 4 slightly satisfied |
| 2 moderately dissatisfied | 5 moderately satisfied |
| 3 slightly dissatisfied | 6 very satisfied |

APPENDIX B
EXAMINING JOB DISSATISFACTION #2

EXAMINING JOB DISSATISFACTION #2

NAME _____ DATE _____

1. In the week since you Q-Sorted, have you made any changes in your responses? If so, which values were changed on which items?

2. Having used the Q-Sort, please rate your level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with each component of your job again.

Using the following scale:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 very dissatisfied | 4 slightly satisfied |
| 2 moderately dissatisfied | 5 moderately satisfied |
| 3 slightly dissatisfied | 6 very satisfied |

I would rate myself as:

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | with the security provided by my job |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | with the working conditions |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | with the match between my skills and personality,
and my job |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | with my relationships with my supervisors, co-
workers and subordinates |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | with the chances of advancement |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | with the personal satisfaction I'm getting from
the work itself |

3. Now that you have Q-Sorted, look at the "dislikes" you mentioned on the first questionnaire and indicate how IMPORTANT they are to you now.

[illegible]

4. Now that you have Q-Sorted, what other aspects of your work have you found that cause you dissatisfaction? Indicate how IMPORTANT each is by circling a number at the right of your answer.

[illegible]

5. Read ALL of the following statements FIRST and check the ones that are TRUE for you.

- _____ 1. I feel that I knew specifically what my problems at work were before I Q-Sorted and I did not learn anything new.
- _____ 2. Before sorting I felt a general sense of dissatisfaction at work and I still do.
- _____ 3. Before sorting I felt a general sense of dissatisfaction at work but after sorting I feel I know better the specific factors that are problems.
- _____ 4. Before sorting I had some ideas about my dissatisfactions at work and these have been confirmed.
- _____ 5. Before sorting I knew some of the specific problems at my job and I have found some more.
- _____ 6. Here are factors troubling me at work which did not appear on any of the cards. They are _____
- _____ 7. By sorting I found that I liked my job more than I thought I did.
- _____ 8. I found there were more things I liked about my job than I disliked.
- _____ 9. The Q-Sort really forced me to think about my priorities.
- _____ 10. I feel more confused about my job dissatisfaction than I did before I used the Q-Sort.
- _____ 11. For me other benefits of using the Q-Sort were:

Any other comments about the Q-Sort will be appreciated.

APPENDIX C
Q-SORT QUESTIONNAIRE

Q-SORT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What were the results of the Q-Sort for you? (Check all statements that are true for you.)

_____ confirmed problems I suspected	_____ did not help me at all
_____ uncovered additional problems	_____ confused me
_____ clarified problems	(add other results you had)
_____ showed more likes than I suspected	_____
_____ showed more likes than dislikes	_____
_____ helped me set priorities	_____

2. Compared to the first card-sorting session, was the second session:

1	2	3	4	5
of no use		as useful as session 1		much more useful than session 1

3A. Has the use of the Q-Sort affected your attitude toward your job?

1	2	3	4	5
not at all				a great deal

3B. Have the discussions in the second session affected your attitude toward your job?

1	2	3	4	5
not at all				a great deal

3C. Please explain how each session influenced your attitude toward your job.

4. What career decisions or plans have you made since doing the Q-Sort?

5A. How did the Q-Sort results influence your decisions or plans?

5B. How did the discussions in the second session influence your decisions or plans?

6. What suggestions do you have for improving?

A) the first session

B) the second session

APPENDIX D
Q-SORT OF JOB SATISFACTION

Q-SORT OF JOB SATISFACTION**"REAL"****"IDEAL"**

SE-1 My job offers a steady income	SE-1 I want to have a steady income
SE-2 My job offers a sufficient income	SE-2 I want to earn a sufficient income
SE-3 My job offers me permanent employment	SE-3 I want to have permanent employment
SE-4 My job offers me an acceptable benefit package	SE-4 I want to have an acceptable benefit package
SE-5 My job offers me acceptable vacation time	SE-5 I want to have acceptable vacation time
SE-6 My job offers a reasonable pension plan	SE-6 I want to have a reasonable pension plan
SE-7 My income could be increased with improved performance	SE-7 I want my income increased with increased performance
SE-8 My job offers the possibility of early retirement	SE-8 I want to have possibility of early retirement
SE-9 My income could increase with more responsibility	SE-9 I want my income to increase with more responsibility
WO-10 My surroundings are clean comfortable	WO-10 I want clean and comfortable surroundings
WO-11 I have sufficient information to do my job	WO-11 I want sufficient information to do my job
WO-12 My job is physically safe	WO-12 I want my job to be physically safe
WO-13 I am under pressure at work	WO-13 I want pressure on my job
WO-14 My work and my private life are separate	WO-14 I want my work and private life to be separate
WO-15 I have the equipment to do my job	WO-15 I want the equipment to do my job
WO-16 My hours of work are suitable to me	WO-16 I want my work hours to be suitable to me
WO-17 I have a variety of tasks at work	WO-17 I want a variety of tasks at work
WO-18 My work takes me to a variety of locations	WO-18 I want my work to take me to a variety of locations
SK-19 My skills are fully utilized	SK-19 I want my skills to be fully utilized
SK-20 My job reflects my interests	SK-20 I want my job to reflect my interests
SK-21 My personality and job are compatible	SK-21 I want my personality and job to be compatible
SK-22 I can respond to the demands of my job	SK-22 I wish I could respond to the demands of my job
SK-23 I work well with deadlines/competition	SK-23 I want to work with deadlines/competition
SK-24 I have enough to do at work	SK-24 I want enough to do at work
SK-25 I see a purpose in my work	SK-25 I want to see a purpose in my work

"REAL"

SK-26 At work I know what is expected of me

SK-27 My work is in keeping with my personal values/ethics

INT-28 I work well with my fellow workers

INT-29 I can/do socialize with my fellow workers

INT-30 I have a satisfactory relationship with the public

INT-31 I am treated as an equal by others

INT-32 I am able to express my ideas/opinions to my supervisor

INT-33 The people I work with are competent

INT-34 I receive feedback about my work

INT-35 I can be myself

INT-36 I feel I am important at my place of work

GR-37 I have chances for advancement

GR-38 I have chances for lateral transfers

GR-39 My advancement is based on my experience

GR-40 My advancement is based on handling more responsibility

GR-41 I have chances for educational leave

GR-42 I have opportunity for in-service training

GR-43 My employer promotes personal interest programs

GR-44 My employer gives me credit for doing good work

GR-45 I have the chance to take on more responsibility

SA-46 I use my special skills and knowledge

SA-47 I am able to make decisions regarding my work

SA-48 I develop my own solutions to problems

SA-49 My work stimulated my thinking

"IDEAL"

SK-26 I want to know what is expected of me at work

SK-27 I want my job to be in keeping with my personal values/ethics

INT-28 I wish to work well with fellow workers

INT-29 I wish to socialize with fellow workers

INT-30 I wish to have a satisfactory relationship with the public

INT-31 I wish to be treated as an equal by others

INT-32 I want to be able to express my ideas/opinions to my supervisor

INT-33 I want to work with competent people

INT-34 I want feedback about my work

INT-35 I want to be myself

INT-36 I want to feel that I'm important at my place of work

GR-37

GR-38 I want chances for lateral transfers

GR-39 I want advancement to come with years of experience

GR-40 I want advancement to come with increased responsibility

GR-41 I want chances for educational leave

GR-42 I want the opportunity for in-service training

GR-43 I want the employer to promote personal interest programs

GR-44 I want my employer to give me credit for doing good work

GR-45 I want the chance to take on more responsibility

SA-46 I want to use my special skills and knowledge

SA-47 I want to make decisions regarding my work

SA-48 I want to develop my own solutions to problems

SA-49 I want my work to stimulate my thinking

"REAL"

SA-50 I am allowed to use my own
imagination/creativity
SA-51 I feel that I am doing a
good job
SA-52 I have the chance to achieve
long term goals
SA-53 I have the chance to display
leadership qualities
SA-54 I am trusted to work
independently

"IDEAL"

SA-50 I want to use my own
imagination/creativity
SA-51 I want to feel that I am doing
a good job
SA-52 I want the chance to achieve
long term goals
SA-53 I want the chance to display
leadership qualities
SA-54 I want to be trusted to work
independently

APPENDIX E
EXAMINING JOB SATISFACTION

EXAMINING JOB SATISFACTION

SE		SORT I	SORT W	DIFFERENCE
1.	STEADY INCOME	1.		
2.	SUFFICIENT INCOME	2.		
3.	PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT	3.		
4.	ACCEPTABLE BENEFITS	4.		
5.	ACCEPTABLE VACATION	5.		
6.	REASONABLE PENSION PLAN	6.		
7.	INCOME INCREASE WITH INCREASED PERFORMANCE	7.		
8.	POSSIBLE EARLY RETIREMENT	8.		
9.	INCOME INCREASES WITH INCREASED RESPONSIBILITY	9.		
WO				
10.	CLEAN AND COMFORTABLE SURROUNDINGS	10.		
11.	SUFFICIENT INFORMATION	11.		
12.	JOB IS PHYSICALLY SAFE	12.		
13.	UNDER PRESSURE AT WORK	13.		
14.	WORK AND PRIVATE LIFE SEPARATE	14.		
15.	ADEQUATE EQUIPMENT	15.		
16.	SUITABLE HOURS OF WORK	16.		
17.	VARIETY OF TASKS	17.		
18.	MOVEMENT TO A VARIETY OF LOCATIONS	18.		

SK		SORT I	SORT W	DIFFERENCE
19.	SKILLS FULLY UTILIZED	19.		
20.	MY JOB REFLECTS MY INTERESTS	20.		
21.	PERSONALITY COMPATIBLE WITH JOB	21.		
22.	ABLE TO RESPOND TO DEMANDS OF JOB	22.		
23.	PRESENT DEADLINES AND COMPETITION ARE ACCEPTABLE	23.		
24.	ENOUGH TO DO AT WORK	24.		
25.	I SEE A PURPOSE IN MY WORK	25.		
26.	KNOW WHAT IS EXPECTED OF ME	26.		
27.	WORK COMPATIBLE WITH PERSONAL VALUES AND ETHICS	27.		

IN

28.	WORK WELL WITH FELLOW WORKERS	28.		
29.	SOCIALIZE WITH FELLOW WORKERS	29.		
30.	SATISFACTORY RELATIONSHIP WITH PUBLIC	30.		
31.	TREATED AS AN EQUAL	31.		
32.	EXPRESS MY IDEAS/OPINIONS TO SUPERVISOR	32.		
33.	COMPETENT PEOPLE TO WORK WITH	33.		
34.	RECEIVE FEEDBACK	34.		
35.	BE MYSELF	35.		
36.	FEEL IMPORTANT AT WORK PLACE	36.		

GR		SORT I	SORT W	DIFFERENCE
37.	CHANCES FOR ADVANCEMENT	37.		
38.	CHANCES FOR LATERAL TRANSFERS	38.		
39.	ADVANCEMENT BASED ON EXPERIENCE	39.		
40.	ADVANCEMENT BASED ON INCREASED RESPONSIBILITY	40.		
41.	CHANCES FOR EDUCATIONAL LEAVE	41.		
42.	CHANCES FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING	42.		
43.	EMPLOYER PROMOTES PERSONAL INTEREST PROGRAMS	43.		
44.	CREDIT GIVEN FOR GOOD WORK	44.		
45.	CHANCE FOR MORE RESPONSIBILITY	45.		

SA

46.	USE SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS	46.		
47.	MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT MY WORK	47.		
48.	DEVELOP MY OWN SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS	48.		
49.	MY WORK STIMULATES MY THINKING	49.		
50.	ALLOWED TO USE MY IMAGINATION/ CREATIVITY	50.		
51.	FEEL I'M DOING A GOOD JOB	51.		
52.	CHANCE TO ACHIEVE LONG TERM GOALS	52.		
53.	CHANCE TO DISPLAY LEADERSHIP	53.		
54.	TRUSTED TO WORK INDEPENDENTLY	54.		

University of Alberta Library



0 1620 0645 2658

B34328